ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.	DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW
ED002620	N.A.	N.A.	

4. AUTHOR(S): N.A.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
Third Annual Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN: Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth, Subcommittee on the Migrant Child, 401 State Bldg. No. 1, Sacramento, Calf.

PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth, Subcommittee on the Migrant Child, 401 State Bldg. No.1, Sacramento, Calf.

CITY, STATE: Sacramento, Calf.

TELE. EXT.

INST/LOC CODE

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	3/62	38

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE: YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED: YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED: YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT: PROPOSAL ☐ IN-PROGRESS ☐ FINAL ☒ FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: Report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

disadvantaged	agriculture	planning	salaries	migrant children
environment	occupations	health services	community development	rural workers
conferences	housing	working conditions	migrant workers	California

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

The selected presentations were: "The Continuing Interest of the Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth, in the Farm Worker's Children" by Helen MacGregor; "The Purpose of this Conference" by Mrs. Hubert Wyckoff; "Trends in California Agriculture -- Effects on Farm Workers" by Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr.; "Characteristics of Farm Workers as Related to Stabilization of the Work Force" by William H. Metzler; "Housing for Farm Labor, Old Problem--New Solution" by Lowell Nelson; "Migrant Children in California Schools" by Helen Heffernan; "Planning for Rural California" by Elton R. Andrews; "California Department of Employment Moves to Improve Services to Agricultural Migrants" by Margot Wakeman Lenhart; "California's Disability Insurance Program for Farm Workers" by Arthur W. Sawyer; "New Farm Labor Health Service" by Bruce Jessup; and "New Minimum Wage and Working Condition Regulations as They Apply to Women and Minors Employed in Farm Work" by Beatrice L. Christensen.

There were six study groups whose deliberations were reported. Their areas of interest included education, health, child care, housing, employment, and community development.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OF PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

ED002620

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Third Annual CONFERENCE ON FAMILIES WHO FOLLOW THE CROPS

Visalia, California
March 1, 2, 1962

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth
Subcommittee on the Migrant Child

401 State Building No. 1
Sacramento 14, California

J0589

ED002620

Third Annual CONFERENCE ON FAMILIES WHO FOLLOW THE CROPS

1962 SPONSORS

RAYMOND B. AUKER
Fresno Community Council

ROGER E. BARTINDALE
Personnel Manager and Harvest Supervisor, Coit Ranch, Mendota

HERBERT BAUER, M.D.
Public Health Director, Yolo County

WILLIAM BECKER
Area Representative Jewish Labor Committee

THOMAS G. BELL
Director, Kern County Welfare Department

J. J. BENN, M.D.
Chairman, Rural Health Committee California Medical Association

LUADA BOSWELL
Special Field Adviser, Girl Scouts of the U.S.A.

A. FRANK BREWER, M.D.
Health Officer and Medical Director Merced County

MILTON CHERNIN
Professor of Social Welfare University of California

J. MALCOLM CRAWFORD
Chairman, Tulare County Board of Supervisors

JUDGE WINSLOW CHRISTIAN
Chairman, Welfare Study Commission

MRS. A. J. CLIFF
Chairman, Region 5, California Farm Bureau Women
Past State Chairman

SIDNEY L. CRUFF
Farmer, Fresno County

MRS. C. H. CULBERTSON
President, California Congress of Parents and Teachers

R. D. DEWHIRST
Chairman, Tulare County Housing Authority

MRS. LELA MAY DUKE
Member and Steward Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee, AFL, CIO

CHARLOTTE D. ELMOTT
Director California Branch, Devereux Research and Training Institute

E. M. FAYE
Former
President, Sunsweet Growers, Inc.

JOE FREITAS
Youth Chairman,
State Junior Chamber of Commerce

MRS. J. C. GOBLE
San Jose

ALLAN GRANT
First Vice President,
California Farm Bureau Federation

THE REV. WAYNE C. HARTMIRE, JR.
Director, California Migrant Ministry

BRENT D. HASS
Producer, Patterson

MRS. PHYLLIS KELLOGG
Sutter County Farm Bureau

DANIEL E. KOSHLAND
San Francisco

GEORGE I. KRELL
Executive Director, California Association for Health and Welfare

BARD McALLISTER
Farm Labor Secretary
American Friends Service Committee

DAVIS McENTIRE
Professor of Social Welfare and Lecturer in Agricultural Economics, University of California, Berkeley

WILLIAM R. MacDOUGALL
Manager, County Supervisors Association of California

HELEN R. MacGREGOR
Chairman, Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth

WALTER G. MARTIN
County Superintendent of Schools Fresno County

GORDON MONFORT
Secretary Manager, Central California Farmers Committee

ROBERT MYTINGER
Executive Secretary, Western Branch, American Public Health Association

WILLIAM T. O'REAR
Secretary, Central Labor Council of Fresno and Madera Counties

B. R. PACKER, M.D.
Fresno

HELEN PHELAN
Catholic Social Service Organization Watsonville

THOMAS L. PITTS
Executive Secretary-Treasurer, California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO

DOMER F. POWER
Citrus and Olive Grower Strathmore

THE REV. BRUNO E. PUESCHEL
Minister, First Congregational Church, Wasco

ARTHUR J. RENDON, A.I.A.
Secretary, Council of Mexican American Affairs

EARL ROUSE
Director, City of Wasco Housing Authority

JEROME N. SAMPSON
Executive Secretary,
Welfare Study Commission

THE REV. PAUL SHELFORD
Executive Director, Northern California Council of Churches

THE REV. JOHN G. SIMMONS
Chairman, Emergency Committee to Aid Farm Workers

SYDNEY SMITH
State Chairman, California Migrant Ministry Committee

I. W. SWAGERTY
State Delegate, California Farm Bureau Federation
Hughson

HON. CARLOS M. TERAN
Judge of the Superior Court Los Angeles County

MRS. HUBERT WYCKOFF
Chairman, Subcommittee on the Migrant Child, Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth

LOUIS ZARATE
President, Community Service Organization

0520022

MISS HELEN R. MacGREGOR, Chairman
Oakland
EMMET DALY, Vice-Chairman
San Francisco
ROY C. VOTAW, Executive Secretary
Sacramento
DR. RICHMOND BARBOUR, San Diego
MR. ROBERT BEYER, Modesto
MRS. PAULYN CLARK, Los Angeles
MR. FRANK A. COLSTON, Ventura
JUDGE MELVYN I. CRONIN, San Francisco
MRS. C. H. CULBERTSON, Long Beach
MR. JOHN A. DAVIS, Martinez
MRS. ERNEST DEBS, Los Angeles
MR. HOMER E. DETRICH, San Diego
REVEREND JAMES B. FLYNN, San Francisco
MR. JOE FREITAS, Manteca
MR. BERTRAM H. GOLD, Los Angeles
MR. MILTON L. GOLDBERG, Los Angeles
MRS. CHARLES P. GOULD, San Marino
MRS. EARL J. HAZELTON, Orland
WILLIAM B. McKESSON, Los Angeles
MRS. NAOMI BARKER MITCHELL, Berkeley
A. EDWARD NICHOLS, Los Angeles
REVEREND ROY NICHOLS, Oakland
MRS. JEANADA NOLAN, Sacramento
MR. WILLIAM T. O'REAR, Fresno
MR. RAYMOND C. PETERSON, Long Beach
MR. ARTHUR J. RENDON, Los Angeles
REVEREND PAUL SHELFORD, San Francisco
MRS. ANTONIO SILVA, Concord
MRS. ROY L. SLATER, North Hollywood
DR. STANLEY SPAID, Arcata
JUDGE CARLOS M. TERAN, Claremont
MR. GRANT THOMPSON, Arcadia
MR. WILLIAM H. THOMPSON, JR., Los Angeles
DR. HENRY J. WEGROCKI, Los Angeles
MRS. HUBERT WYCKOFF, JR., Watsonville
MR. LOUIS ZARATE, San Jose

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS
DR. DANIEL BLAIN
Director, State Department of Mental Hygiene
JOHN F. FISHER
Executive Officer, State Personnel Board
JOHN F. HENNING
Director, State Department of Industrial Relations
TOM BRIGHT
Director, State Department of Motor Vehicles
DR. MALCOLM H. MERRILL
Director, State Department of Public Health
STANLEY MOSK
Attorney General
DeWITT NELSON
Director, State Department of Natural Resources
IRVING H. PERLUSS
Director, State Department of Employment
DR. ROY E. SIMPSON
Director, State Department of Education
HEMAN G. STARK
Director, State Department of the Youth Authority
JOHN M. WEDEMEYER
Director, State Department of Social Welfare

STAFF COMMITTEE
DR. WILLIAM B. BEACH, JR., Chairman
State Department of Mental Hygiene
C. RAY VARLEY
Governor's Office
ROBERT H. HILL
State Department of Employment
GLADYS SNYDER
State Department of Natural Resources
LESLIE CORSA, M.D.
State Department of Public Health
LELAND ERBACHER
State Personnel Board
LAWRENCE FORD
State Department of Industrial Relations
HAROLD J. FRAULOB
State Department of Motor Vehicles
HERMAN GALLEGOS
State Department of Industrial Relations
CHARLES A. JAMES
State Department of Justice
LUCILE KENNEDY
State Department of Social Welfare
DONALD E. KITCH
State Department of Education
DR. BELLE POOLE
State Department of Public Health
NATHAN SLOATE
State Department of Mental Hygiene
GEORGE SALEEBEY
State Department of the Youth Authority

EDMUND G. BROWN
GOVERNOR

GOVERNOR'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

401 State Building No. 1
SACRAMENTO 14, CALIFORNIA

June 8, 1962

Honorable Edmund G. Brown
Governor of California
Sacramento, California

Dear Governor Brown:

Herewith enclosed is the final and official report of the Third Annual Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops, held to gain a better understanding of the problems faced by the children of our seasonal farm workers and the rural communities in which they grow up. The Conference met in Visalia, California, March 1, 2, 1962.

Your Advisory Committee on Children and Youth has maintained a continuing interest in cooperating with the statewide organizations having similar concern for our migrant children. This year fifty sponsors joined in issuing the call for the Conference, helped with program planning and gave generously of time and effort to make it possible.

Of the 362 registered participants, 60 were growers, and 44 were farm workers. The remainder included teachers, doctors, nurses, county supervisors, public or private agency workers and other interested persons serving rural communities. They met in small study groups for two days and attempted to find areas of agreement in which they could cooperate to improve migrant life. Their recommendations are included in this report. No action was taken in Plenary Session upon these recommendations because it has been the policy to ask only those who have heard full discussion of a topic to pass upon it. However, the Advisory Committee finds these reports of genuine value because they reflect the results of long and earnest consideration by a representative group of citizens, including the parents of the children for whom we have such deep concern. These recommendations have been reviewed by the Advisory Committee and those on which administrative action might be taken have been communicated to you in the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Committee.

The participants were asked to evaluate the sessions and there was almost unanimous expression that there should be a Fourth Annual Conference. As one farmer put it: "These problems did not come about in a short period. Three or four or six conferences may not solve them all. However, through amicable discussions we may be able to eliminate them one by one."

Dr. Eric Thor, Economist, Giannini Foundation said it this way: "Ten years ago the growers and the farm workers wouldn't even sit in the same room. Five years ago they were able to sit in the same room but on opposite sides. Now they mix around and chat with each other. So we really are making progress in communication."

A farm worker said after the first session: "Well, I have learned that this grower isn't a monster and he has learned that I am not a wino."

The Advisory Committee shares the belief that through improved communication, understanding, and a sincere desire to cooperate, a way can be found to overcome many of the handicaps now faced by those children in health, education, housing, and opportunity to develop. Our philosophy has been to encourage self-reliance and to strengthen the family and those basic local services which should be within the reach of all of our citizens whoever they are - a goal we have not yet attained.

Together with our dedicated group of co-sponsors we hope to find the way to enable all families in our rural communities to prosper and raise their children to be strong, healthy good citizens of America.

Respectfully submitted,

Helen R MacGregor

Miss Helen R. MacGregor
Chairman, Governor's Advisory
Committee on Children and Youth

Florence R. Wyckoff

Mrs. Hubert Wyckoff
Chairman, Subcommittee on the
Migrant Child

Third Annual

CONFERENCE ON FAMILIES WHO FOLLOW THE CROPS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SELECTED PRESENTATIONS: (As condensed) — PAGE

The continuing interest of the Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth, in the farm worker's children
Miss Helen MacGregor, Chairman, Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth 1

The purpose of this conference
Mrs. Hubert Wyckoff, Chairman, Subcommittee on the Migrant Child, Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth 2

Trends in California agriculture--Effects on farm workers and rural communities - Keynote address
Dr. Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr., University Dean of Agriculture, University of California 4

Characteristics of farm workers as related to stabilization of the work force
Wm. H. Metzler, Farm Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture 9

Housing for farm labor, old problem--new solution
Lowell Nelson, Chief, Division of Housing, California Department of Industrial Relations 14

Migrant children in California schools
Helen Heffernan, Chief, Bureau of Elementary Education, California Department of Education 19

Planning for rural California
Elton R. Andrews, Director, Office of Planning, California Department of Finance 25

California Department of Employment moves to improve services to agricultural migrants
Margot Wakeman Lenhart, Farm Placement Supervisor, California Department of Employment 29

California's disability insurance program for farm workers
Arthur W. Sawyer, Area Administrative Officer, Division of Disability and Hospital Benefits, Department of Employment 32

New farm labor health service
Bruce Jessup, M.D., Rural Health Consultant, California Department of Public Health 34

New minimum wage and working condition regulations as they apply to women and minors employed in farm work
Beatrice L. Christensen, Special Representative, Division of Industrial Welfare, Department of Industrial Relations 38

REPORTS OF SIX STUDY GROUPS:

1 - EDUCATION 41
2 - HEALTH 47
3 - CHILD CARE 55
4 - HOUSING 56
5 - EMPLOYMENT 60
6 - COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT 68

THE CONTINUING INTEREST OF THE GOVERNOR'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH IN THE FARM WORKER'S CHILDREN

By
Miss Helen MacGregor, Chairman
Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth

In behalf of the Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth, I welcome you to the Third Annual Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops. We are only one of fifty sponsors, but I have the privilege of extending the welcome.

This conference is part of a long-term process in behalf of the children and their families. It is a process with a history growing out of concern for these families and their children and a desire that these children may have an equal opportunity for health, education, and the good life of America.

I cannot say when this process began. My own involvement commenced as the conference of 1949 was planned. I recall Governor Warren's appointing the Committee on Agricultural Labor in the San Joaquin Valley in March, 1950. The report of that committee expresses concern over the very same problems to which our study groups are devoting their attention.

Progress has been made and we are here to build on this progress. The Governor's Advisory Committee has been working on these problems during the past 12 years.

By way of background, the origin of the Advisory Committee was the Youth In Wartime Committee appointed by Governor Warren in November, 1943. It was so helpful that it was continued as the Advisory Committee on Children and Youth and each of the succeeding governors has continued the committee.

It is the practice of the Advisory Committee to bring other people into its areas of concern for various purposes such as studies and conferences. This and the preceding conferences have been co-sponsored by the committee and people drawn from organizations concerned with special problems of families following the crops.

We have recognized that part of the difficulty has been lack of communication among people, organizations, and agencies, with concerns or responsibilities. To establish communication among more people and to broaden the areas of agreement have been the purposes of the conferences at Fresno in March, 1959, at San Jose in October, 1960, and of this conference.

On the philosophy of the conferences, I quote from our Chairman, Mrs. Hubert Wyckoff: "Our philosophy has been to encourage self-reliance and to strengthen the family and those basic local services which should be within the reach of all of our citizens whoever they are--a goal we have not yet attained."

This conference is part of a vast process of cooperation and devotion on the part of many people--the staffs of state and federal agencies, local people, and great numbers affiliated with the sponsors. The leadership has been given by the Subcommittee on the Migrant Child, in the Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth.

THE PURPOSE OF THIS CONFERENCE

By
Mrs. Hubert Wyckoff, Chairman
Subcommittee on the Migrant Child
Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth

Each of us has come to this conference for many reasons, but I believe we share one bond in common--we care what happens to the children of our farm workers, and we care about the rural communities of California where many children are born, grow up and learn to be either good or bad citizens, depending on how well we are all able to cooperate to create a healthy environment in which to grow up.

This conference is for the purpose of improving communication and understanding between all of us. We have come to learn from each other. Those of us who come from the professions may think we know something about the problems of the farmers and the farm workers--but in the last analysis, it is better not to talk about people behind their backs. In trying to find practical ways to improve the environment, we had best be sure to include the very people who are most affected--namely the farmers and the farm workers. It has been our goal to achieve better participation by these two groups at the conference over the past three years. The California Farm Bureau has been most helpful in stimulating attendance by farmers. This year we were fortunate enough to receive a small grant of $910 from Rosenberg Foundation for clerical expenses, printing and mailing, and it included the sum of $250 for scholarships to cover meals, lodging and transportation for farm workers. This sum was divided between four groups which selected the recipients of the scholarships: The Community Service Organization, The Sequoia Farm Labor Cooperative Contractors, the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee, and the California Migrant Ministry. So this year we will not be talking in a vacuum or trying to decide what is good for somebody far away whom we don't know and can't consult.

The past two annual conferences extended the life of the Steering Committee and charged it with three duties: (1) To plan the next conference, (2) To encourage the holding of similar county conferences across the state, and (3) To forward recommendations to those designated by the Study Sessions.

As Chairman of the Steering Committee I can report that we have tried to carry out these duties. There have been follow-up conferences held in Kings, Tulare, Kern and Santa Clara Counties of a general nature. The California Farm Bureau Federation has sponsored a series of meetings focussed on health services to farm workers and their families in some nineteen counties, drawing in health, hospital, medical and welfare officials as well as other interested groups. This has done much to stimulate local county governments to improve their health services and participate in the new Farm Labor Health Service Program.

At the last conference we asked members to fill out an evaluation sheet to help decide whether to go ahead and plan another conference. Some of the answers revealed a skeptical attitude about whether any practical results ever came out of all this conferring back and forth. So this year I went back over the recommendations from the past two conferences and was happy to note that eighteen major recommendations had been carried out. For example, those of you who attended the last conference in San Jose will remember that health had a high priority in the plenary sessions. Dr. Bruce Jessup's report was presented at a "Doctors Meet the Press" panel discussion. It is interesting to note what happened after that. The California Farm Bureau Federation, The California Congress of Parents and Teachers,

and various other sponsors of the conference, devoted a lot of time and effort to legislative support for the Farm Labor Health Service Bill introduced by Senator Vergil O'Sullivan and Assemblyman Myron Frew. The bill passed, and the various county meetings I have described helped to implement it. Today and tomorrow you will hear the community teams from four counties tell the practical results of what happened. This year the Steering Committee and the Program Planning Committee selected the main topics of Education and Housing as the primary focus of our two Plenary Session luncheons and we hope, after the conference, that those of you who are in a position to take action will join hands to cooperate for any improvements upon which you can agree.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank our excellent group of sponsors for their generous assistance in terms of time and effort spent on program planning and all the hard work that goes into holding such a conference as this. Without such a demonstration of good will on their part we would never be here today. This we hope is a good omen and in our study sessions we will all become well enough acquainted to find the way toward cooperation and working together so that all families in our rural communities may prosper and raise their children to be strong, healthy good citizens of America.

TRENDS IN CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURE--EFFECTS ON FARM WORKERS AND RURAL COMMUNITIES

Keynote Address

By

Dr. Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr.
University Dean of Agriculture
University of California

I hardly need tell you people, who have come here, I believe, from thirty counties, that we are a nation of travelers. It is fairly well accepted, I think, that Americans--and Californians especially--get around a lot. By choice.

In this conference we are concerned with a group of people, a group of many thousands, who also get around a lot--some by choice, but some not at all by choice. Studies by university people tell us that most of our migrant farm workers, who follow the crops from state to state or county to county, would really like to settle down. But we also know that as long as we continue to grow the crops that are peculiarly adapted to California's unique climates and soils, great numbers of farm workers are going to be needed in certain areas for short, intensive periods of employment.

We are mechanizing faster than any other part of the country; and we are harvesting some of our crops now with fewer hours of labor than any other area in the world. We may level employment peaks as we increase mechanization. But still, researchers tell us, we are going to need large numbers of workers to harvest our crops in the years ahead.

In some of our counties the year behind us has brought some encouraging developments. Climate, patterns of crops, and new patterns and philosophy in the use of people are pointing toward a stability American farm labor has never known. Perhaps still more encouraging, there is a trend in California, a trend among farmers, farm workers, the State Department of Employment, and university researchers, to do something about the instability and transience of agricultural labor--a trend to study, to experiment, and to look toward a future when farm workers may enjoy more year-around employment.

First I must say that hired labor is still the largest single expense item for California farmers. As wages rise this expense increases; so farmers, trying to hold the line on costs, turn to mechanization. They must continually battle costs, if they are to stay solvent and stay in the competition with other farmers in other states and other countries. In California as all over this country, mechanization and labor productivity have gone up more in agriculture than in other parts of the economy. To show you how much we have mechanized.....

In 1949 only six per cent of the U.S. cotton crop was mechanized. In 1960, nine years later, 51 per cent was picked by machine--51 per cent of the nation's crop; 87 per cent of California's.

Potato harvesting machines in two California areas are cutting potato harvest time from 62,980 man-weeks in 1960 to 25,600 man-weeks this year.

A mechanized carrot harvest in one area shows us that a crew of 17 on a machine can replace a hand-harvesting crew of 44. And the machine crew will harvest 60 tons in a workday where the hand crew harvested 43 tons.

With the help of machines, our farmers pushed up the productivity of labor in vegetable growing by 44 per cent from World War II to 1955. Mechanizing the

harvest of soft fruits is much more difficult than harvesting field crops and root vegetables, yet during the same 16 years the output per man-hour in fruits and nuts rose 14 per cent.

But our harvest peaks have not been melting away. History suggests otherwise. Fifty years ago California hired 120,000 farm workers at the peak of the season. Thirty years ago the count had grown to 197,000. By 1950 it had reached 328,000. That's where mechanization set in in earnest. Last year the season's peak roll of farm workers was 370,000.

What about the future? By 1975 the United States will probably have a population of 230 million people, at least. And a tenth of these people, or more, will be in California. For at least some of our 200 commercial crops in California, all 230 million people will be part of our market. This is particularly true for our fruit and nut and vegetable crops, our biggest labor users.

And so our economists look into the future and this is what they see: more mechanization and increased labor productivity; but also growing markets, increased yields from maturing orchards and new cultural methods, and still more seasonal farm jobs than we have today.

Farm mechanization is essential, and it will come as fast as research and farmer ingenuity can bring it. But mechanization is not a short-run solution for extreme labor seasonality, instability of labor supply, the relatively high labor costs to farmers, or relatively low wage returns to farm workers.

There's also this related problem, too: the growers of one crop may depend heavily on the labor supply that harvests another crop in the season just ahead or behind. Apricot harvest, for example, lasts about two weeks in any one area. Pickers won't migrate into an area for that little work. But most apricot areas also grow plums, pears, and peaches. Working in all of these crops, a picker has a fairly long season. Mechanizing any one of them could compound the difficulty of getting labor for the others. We may have to mechanize several related crops at the same time.

In California, as may be expected, we have special problems not even conceived of in the corn-hog states. Take just three of our central counties: Yolo, Sacramento, and San Joaquin, all tremendous users of seasonal labor. Growing seasons are short, as California growing seasons go. Climate largely determines the farming patterns: tomatoes, sugar beets, grapes, and fruit and nut crops. Climate and crops determine the harvest season: and the harvests not only overlap, they run at the same time. Peaks run from 60 to 90 days. These counties employ thousands, yet it is almost impossible to employ more than a few for longer than 90 days.

If we are going to see a stable labor force organized in Yolo, Sacramento, or San Joaquin County, we'll surely have to call on other areas of the economy. (This is by no means a new problem. A University of California agriculturist wrote an article in 1911 pointing to the need for a combination of agricultural and nonagricultural jobs to give year-around employment.) The problem cries for industries, but for special industries that can use the same kind of labor agriculture uses, that can use it when agriculture does not need it, and can shut down and release its labor to the land when harvest season comes. Are we dreaming when we think of such industries? I hope not, because without them labor stability in our high-peak agricultural counties is surely a dream.

I can point to some other counties, also heavy users of farm labor, where cropping patterns are different, and the 12-month working year may not be a dream. In Kern, Tulare, Fresno, Ventura, and Riverside Counties, for example, crops are diverse, and cultural and harvest work spreads over the year.

You may be interested in what's going on right here in Tulare County. Here, of course, is one of our most diverse growers of crops in the State, with deciduous fruits and nuts, citrus, livestock, vegetables--the full gamut of agricultural enterprise. For the past year a farmer group in Tulare County has been running an experimental crew, working as a team under a crew leader. The crew performs one farm operation; then it moves over to another operation in the same area. If necessary, the crew members are trained in the skills of the new job.

One of the blocks to year-around farm labor in a state as intensively farmed as California has been that many workers are specialists. Some specialize in pruning, others in fruit harvesting. Usually they move from area to area as seasonal workers. Many growers, too, find it convenient to contract with crew leaders who sell the services of specialized worker teams. But if we are going to have year-around crews, growers will need understanding and sympathy toward workers while they are learning new skills.

Our part of this project, in the University, is a study by our Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics, following the experimental crew as it works the year-around within one county. Our economists collected information during 1961 on wage rates, hours worked, types of work performed, supervisional problems that come with changing types of work, reasons for labor turnover, and earnings of individual workers and crews. This involved collecting information on each crew member daily for all days worked.

A group of farm workers, with the help of the American Friends Service Committee, has also been experimenting here with a year-around crew doing many farm jobs. This team has done an excellent job, and has worked practically every week of the season. The workers who organized it should get credit for a truly American team approach to their own problem.

The State Department of Employment--and our people are working closely with it, too--has its Annual Worker Plan. The director of that department, Irving Perluss, told us at a meeting in Berkeley two weeks ago that he is convinced there is a trend toward more continuity in California farm employment, and some decrease in turnover. The State's Annual Worker Plan aims, just as the Tulare County experimental crews do, at making maximum use of local labor. The plan promotes re-engagement of the satisfied worker with the satisfied employer. It encourages firm commitments by both grower and worker. Mr. Perluss's office is registering and identifying individual workers and building work records, with cooperation of the farmers. Wherever it can, his department is trying to refer workers to farms for the duration of the job rather than on the old casual, nameless, day-haul basis. Often, he said, we have had the chaotic farm labor situation of farmers desperately hunting workers and workers desperately hunting jobs at the same time.

This problem of leveling off farm employment peaks, stabilizing and stretching the work year, and raising the year's total take for the farm workers is getting serious attention. Our Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics has made a study in Solano County, aimed at establishing fair and equitable piece rates to pay workers. The results should offer some assurance to the worker that he can expect to earn a relatively uniform wage rate regardless of crop and yield conditions.

Another of our activities, based in Kern County, is to project farm labor requirements through 1970. Our people are surveying the types of labor used in the county and estimating the types, and numbers of people, the county will be needing a decade from now. Farmers naturally are interested in planning their long-range investments in equipment and other farm improvements, including housing. Certainly housing has been and still is one of the deterrents to permanence and stability in the farm labor market. It is especially a deterrent to recruiting family people, our most stable "professional" crop workers.

But mortgage money for migrant housing is scarce. This is high-risk investment, when the housing is seldom occupied longer than the harvest season. If a farmer wants to improve worker housing on his place, he has two choices, neither of them good: he can build the housing out of farm profits, if any, or he can mortgage his entire farm enterprise. In either case he is taking a major risk to finance a minor part of his operation. He also faces the constant possibility of new breakthroughs in harvest automation.

Our economic problems--housing, day-to-day jobs, often at best a 90-day season, and earnings that may run little over $1,000 a year--all make their contributions to a social problem. Ultimately it goes far beyond agriculture.

More serious than chronic underemployment, I believe, is what happens to migratory farm children. A presidential commission back in 1951 found that, as a group, migratory farm children were retarded from two to five years in their education. Nine years later another survey found little change. Educational deprivation of migrant children perpetuates the economics and social status of migrant farm people as children and adults.

Our State Department of Education has surveyed the adult educational attainment of migrant farm workers. It found 31 per cent of California's migrants had not gone beyond the third grade. Sixty-one per cent had not gone beyond the sixth grade. Only 12 per cent had finished high school. This is far more than a cultural deficiency. Educational deprivation has put many of these people in the migratory farm labor market. Without more than a third-grade education, a man is almost certainly out of the industrial labor market in these times of increasingly complex machines.

But agriculture is mechanizing rapidly, too. The towering cotton pickers you see crossing the San Joaquin Valley fields through the fall, the sprawling lettuce harvester-packer machines that turned up in the Salinas and Imperial Valleys last year, the tomato picker that ran through its first commercial season last fall, and the grape harvester and asparagus harvester--which are just around the corner--these are all complex machines, too. Some of them are a great deal more complicated than the machines a city worker finds bolted to his factory floor. Some of agriculture's machines are factories on wheels, moving through the fields with a dozen sorters, graders, and packers aboard.

Is a third grader, or a third grader in education, going to run one of these? For the migrant farm worker our rapid mechanization of agriculture is making job opportunities more and more limited. Many of the undereducated and unskilled, instead of finding a haven in farm labor, could be forced out of agriculture by today's and tomorrow's, farm machines. Unless these people get more education or training, they may have difficulty finding employment in either mechanized agriculture or the general labor market.

Of course we can look into the future some distance and still see an ample supply of farm jobs--seasonal ones, at least--for many good workers who lack the education for industry. Agriculture only appears to be shrinking because we look

at it so often from the city fringe. Farms are indeed being crowded by growing cities. And cities are taking some of our finest land, Class I soils like the floor of the Santa Clara Valley around San Jose. Housing subdivisions, factories, and freeways are pushing agriculture to poorer lands, less level, with shallower soils, more costly lands to farm. Farm profits will be hard-pressed to pay the increasing labor and machinery costs.

But our economists look at a market of 230 million people. By 1970, they say, in spite of shrinkage at the city fringes, agricultural acres in California will have increased, with probably 150,000 more acres in vegetables and 350,000 more acres in fruits. Acreage, harvests, and the demand for labor can't help growing.

But we look at another future too. For the children of our migratory families, sometimes five years behind others of their ages, who is to say that enough farm jobs, or any jobs, at the grade three educational level will still be available when they grow up into an advancing world?

The U.S. Senate subcommittee on migratory labor has set forth a challenging series of five key problems to be solved: First is the problem of positive recruitment, to get farm workers where there is work and when there is work. Second is adequate job security, some assurance of wage rates or hours or days to be worked. Third is the problem of keeping migratory workers fully employed within a limited geographical area. Fourth is retraining hand-harvest workers, when they have the skill potential, to be harvest machine operators. And fifth is relocating displaced workers, finding places for hand-harvest workers displaced by machines. All of these are rooted in one problem: an unstable, rising and falling labor market, with unmanageable peaks of labor demands, and unmanageable gullevs of unemployment.

Mechanization is neither a cause nor a remedy. It is inevitable, though, and it is essentially good for both the grower and the worker. It can reduce the number of workers needed at the peaks, and in general it will enable the grower to pay higher wages. We can also see that machines are changing harvest crew composition. While saving over-all labor, both the tomato harvester and lettuce harvester last year created jobs for women on the sorting belts and wrapping tables. But tomatoes, lettuce, grapes, and peaches inevitably will be ready to pick during intense work seasons of short duration. And picker crews, even though smaller and mechanized, must be on hand. Once a crop is on its way, once the farmer's "inputs" of land preparation, seeding, fertilizing, irrigating, pruning, thinning, and cultivating have been spent, there is no return short of the harvest.

Where the season is short, labor peaks will still occur. If agriculture's work force in such areas is to be built around people in the community, the year's employment will have to filled out with nonagricultural industry.

In our diversified, year-around agricultural counties, where the experimental multi-job crews are showing such promise, we may well see balanced, stable, year-around farm employment become a fact.

But the all-job crews will need training, too. Whose job is it? In the San Joaquin Valley two approaches seem to be working. In one case Tulare County farmers have taken the responsibility; they have organized a crew and given a hand in training these people in skills they didn't have. In the other case, workers themselves, with the help of a church group, have taken the responsibility of organization and training. Some feel that retraining of the unskilled and displaced is a social problem, a public responsibility. By whatever means we attack the problem, job training and retraining, and community organization--perhaps integrated industrial-agricultural combinations of jobs--are certainly possible routes to farm labor stability and family stability.

Might this be a top consideration of this year's conference?

Only stability for farm workers can bring stability for their children and the upgrading of a people whose productivity to society and economic well-being are one of the significant challenges of our time.

CHARACTERISTICS OF FARM WORKERS AS RELATED TO STABILIZATION OF THE WORK FORCE*

By
William H. Metzler, Farm Economics Division, Economic Research Service
U. S. Department of Agriculture

I had the opportunity to engage in a survey of farm workers in Kern County last year. There, mechanization of the cotton harvest has proceeded very rapidly. In 1949, 30,000 workers were engaged in picking cotton, and most of them were migrants. In 1961 only 5,000 were used, and there was no migration into the area to engage in the cotton harvest. In fact, during the cotton harvest season, some Kern County residents worked in the prunes, grapes, and walnuts in other counties.

Cotton mechanization in Kern County is not yet entirely complete. Workers still "pick out" the ends of the cotton rows, and pick up the low bolls which the machines have missed. The problem now is that more seasonal employment is needed during the fall and winter in order to permit as many workers to have as close to year-round employment as is possible.

We can expect that in a few years the June peak in labor use in that county will also be leveled off. At one time, a total of 14,000 workers were used to harvest potatoes, chop cotton, girdle grapes, and pick plums during the early part of June. Mechanical potato harvesters are now doing part of the harvest work in potatoes. In a few years they can do it all. A few growers are using a mechanical cotton chopper successfully. As precision planting of cotton is developed, mechanical chopping of cotton will become generally feasible. There are also possibilities for reduction in the number of workers needed for grape girdling.

The result is that within a few years Kern County agriculture could be carried on with no use of outside labor at any time of the year. Around 5,000 to 6,000 workers could do all the seasonal jobs. There are, however, two limitations to the development of a local labor force which can handle all farm work. The first is that fall, winter, and early spring labor demands may be so slack that some workers may have to migrate elsewhere for part of the year in order to have adequate employment. Fall and winter jobs should be built up, if possible.

Equally important is the fact that many workers specialize in working in a few crops, and move with them rather than changing from crop to crop in the same locality. Actually as many as three different labor forces are now used in Kern County during the course of the work season. One group came originally from cotton country and has tried to specialize in cotton chopping and picking. A second group picks potatoes in Kern County in June, then moves to the Chino-Ontario area to pick potatoes there. Later they may also pick potatoes in Northern California and Oregon. The third group, the seasonal grape workers, start moving into the county in July and fill up the grape camps. Yet much of

*Opinions expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the Farm Economics Division, ERS, or the U. S. Dept. of Agriculture.

the labor force in grapes is now employed on close to a year-round basis. Still other groups of workers harvest the plums, the melons, the hay, the citrus and other crops. Counting these smaller groups, more than three different labor forces are used in the county.

It is most difficult to train farm workers to put aside their prejudices in regard to unfamiliar types of work and to shift from crop to crop within their home area. There is no sense in a farm worker in Kern County moving his family to Riverside County to pick potatoes when he could work right at home picking peaches or grapes. The cotton or potato picker who was asked why he didn't work in the grapes usually said, "We always have picked cotton. We never did work in the grapes." or, "Mexicans and Filipinos do that. We don't." Grape workers gave similar responses as to why they didn't work in the cotton or potatoes. A few workers are now beginning to break over these traditional lines, but many more will have to shift over, or they will have to move out of the county because the work season will be too short for several sets of workers.

An educational campaign pointing out the shortcomings of too much specialization and indicating the need for versatility might do much to shape new work habits for these people. This could be part of a retraining program conducted by labor contractors under the guidance of the Farm Placement Service. A tie-in with the County Welfare Department might also be useful. If growers are conscious of their public relations, they could do no better than to sponsor the entire training and stabilization program.

Labor contractors would be key people in any program of stabilizing the work force. Some have very stable crews and try to keep their crew members busy all year. We need more of these contractors and fewer of the more common type who say, "I make no choice between workers. I haul out any man who climbs on the truck." The latter type may have his truck filled with migrants before the local workers have a chance to get on, or when the locals see the workers in his truck they may choose to stay at home. Such contractors build up migrancy, rather than stabilization.

Labor contractors either build up a labor force of migrant families, of undesirables, or of stable local residents--depending on how and where they do their recruiting. But back of the labor contractor stands the grower. Growers who are careful to inquire about the hiring policies of the labor contractors with whom they deal and who give preference to those with stable crews assist the process of settling and stabilizing a work force in their community. Those who use contractors who specialize in "skid-row" crews help to increase the skid-row population. Growers who use migrant contractors or contractors who specialize in migrants, help build up migrancy over the State. As they give outsiders jobs some of the local workers may have to leave home in order to obtain adequate employment.

Insufficient attention has been given to the clannishness of farm workers, and to the reasons for it. When high school students and housewives are in the field and a group of undesirables come in, the students and housewives leave. There are several reasons for this. The average housewife who gets on to a labor contractor's truck may find that some of the male workers on the truck begin to make offensive remarks. She may decide that farm work is not for her.

There is also the problem of privacy and acceptability of toilet facilities in the fields. The presence of workers from the lowest social strata has driven the more self-respecting workers out of the fields in many parts of California. This has down-graded the status of seasonal farm labor in some areas. In some parts of the State the grower of a crop such as cotton apologizes to me if I find him out in the field trying to save some of his crop. In those areas, apparently it is no longer respectable for a grower to do hand work.

The labor contractors and farmers who "day-haul" out of the skid-row areas have unwittingly down-graded the status of some types of farm labor in the State. The same process is beginning to make some headway in our neighboring states--Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. Work in sugar beets, cotton, and vegetable crops has been down-graded the most. Within certain localities, work for particular types of farmers has come to be associated with inferior social status, because of the type of workers that they employ. Growers who have hired the best grade of labor have been unable to counteract this trend.

In discussing popular attitudes toward different kinds of farm wage work, it is necessary to consider the matter of race or ethnic background. Anglo workers tend to look down on jobs that are performed largely by foreign or colored workers. This may simply be a matter of race prejudice, but there may also be some background of unfortunate experience connected with it. In building up a stable local labor force these types of prejudice and ideas of status must be considered. To get farm workers to work together calls for an intimate knowledge of their stereotyped ideas.

Accompanying Tables I-V indicate some of the major characteristics of the present farm work force in Kern County. Of the 696 workers in the sample, 61 percent were seasonal hand workers who picked and chopped the cotton, picked up the potatoes, picked the grapes, plums, or peaches; 25 percent were general farm workers who worked on equipment, at irrigating, at supervision, and at other general farm jobs; 14 percent engaged in shed work, hauling, and other activities related to agriculture. So the former situation of many hand workers and only a few general farm hands no longer pertains. The number of seasonal workers in declining and there is a trend toward more regular farm employment.

Migration is also on the decline. Of the 696 workers, 54 percent lived in Kern County and did not leave during the year. In 1961, then, migratory workers in this county were already in the minority. Five-sixths of the migrants who came in to work came from outside the State--from Texas, Mexico, Arizona, and Oklahoma. One-third of the migrant workers, however, did not come in to work but had their homes in Kern County and had to go elsewhere at some time of the year in order to obtain adequate employment. Over half the farm labor families had come to Kern County since 1950. They were part of a wave of immigrants who came in after World War II or in connection with the Korean War.

The effect of too much specialization by farm workers shows up in employment figures: Almost 15 percent of the 696 workers in the sample in Kern County worked in cotton only--cotton chopping and cotton picking. They had an average of only 79 days of employment and $703 for their year's work. There was practically no employment for them during January, February, March, and April. Almost 10 percent of the workers worked only in potatoes. They averaged 82 days of employment during the year and $964 for their work. By way of contrast, over 10 percent of the workers worked in 5, 6, or 7 crops. They averaged 186 days of employment and $2,152. Heads of households who worked only in cotton had 130 days of work during the year; those who worked only in potatoes had 146 days; and those who worked in 5, 6, or 7 crops had 229 days.

Considering all seasonal farm workers together, however, the major farm work problem in Kern County is not so much one of wage rates as it is one of under-employment. Seasonal farm workers in Kern County in 1960 averaged only 101 days of work as compared to 235 days for those in general farm work. The under-employment problem has at least three aspects. First, the work season is short and unless special steps are taken mechanization may make it even shorter. Research by public agencies is needed in regard to crops and varieties that will

spread out the work season. Second, the present organization of hiring procedures stimulates crop specialization and migrancy. Three or four different labor forces for unskilled seasonal labor hardly squares up with the efficiency that we find in other phases of production. Apparently no one assumes the responsibility of looking after the efficiency of the farming economy in a locality. And third, there are some workers who enjoy leisure along with their employment. Getting welfare payments, free groceries, and other assistance is as much an aspect of their life as sporadic work.

Tables accompanying presentation by Wm. H. Metzler:

Characteristics of Farm Workers, Kern County, 1961 - From a 5 percent sample.

TABLE I - Ethnic Background of Households

Ethnic group	Households reporting		Total members	Members per household	Total workers	Workers per household
	Number	Percent	Number			
Anglo-American	172	48	739	4.3	330	1.9
Spanish-American	80	22	412	5.1	175	2.2
Mexican	33	9	181	5.5	79	2.4
Negro	54	15	237	4.4	84	1.6
Filipino	14	4	46	3.3	15	1.0
Puerto Rican	5	1	9	1.8	6	1.2
Other	3	1	13	4.3	7	2.3
Total	361	100	1,637	4.5	696	1.9

TABLE II - Household Income, 1960

Household income	Percentage of households in each income bracket				
	Nonmigrant	Migrant	General farm worker	Seasonal worker	Nonfarm and processing worker
Under $1,000	10	13	2	20	9
1,000 - 1,999	16	31	13	32	20
2,000 - 2,999	24	24	23	24	24
3,000 - 3,999	21	15	28	12	16
4,000 - 4,999	16	9	20	5	20
5,000 - 5,999	8	3	10	3	4
6,000 and up	5	5	4	4	7
Households reporting	214	147	145	161	55

TABLE III - Plans for Children

	Percentage of households in each planning group[a/]				
	Nonmigrant	Migrant	General farm worker	Seasonal worker	Nonfarm and processing worker
Educate them out of farm work	24	25	25	17	40
Have them attend school	37	22	34	32	20
No plans for education	28	38	32	32	33
Children will have to get along like we did	11	15	9	19	7

a/ Includes only those households with children of school age.

TABLE IV - Work Preference of Head of Household

	Total reporting	Percentage preferring			
		General farm work	Seasonal farm work	Nonfarm work	No preference
	Number	Percent			
Nonmigrants	214	26	16	38	20
Migrants	147	14	36	36	14
General farm workers	145	40	13	28	19
Seasonal workers	161	9	41	32	18
Nonfarm workers	55	5	7	77	11
All heads	361	22	25	37	18

TABLE V - Work and Income of Individual Workers

Family status	Number	Percent	Average days worked in year	Average earnings in year
Head (male)	350	49	191	$2,199
Wife	156	22	80	673
Son, school	46	7	48	383
Son, nonschool	71	10	133	1,206
Daughter, school	24	3	60	468
Daughter, nonschool	22	3	119	947
Other	27	3	103	836
Migrant status				
Local nonmigrant	373	54	154	1,781
Local outmigrant	120	18	122	1,269
Inmigrant	203	29	126	1,132
Major Type of Work				
General farm work	177	26	235	2,849
Seasonal handwork	425	61	101	854
Processing, farm business	50	7	125	1,656
Nonfarm work	44	6	158	1,878
All workers	696	100	140	1,483

HOUSING FOR FARM LABOR, OLD PROBLEM--NEW SOLUTION

By
Lowell Nelson, Chief, Division of Housing
California Department of Industrial Relations

The housing needs of California's agricultural work force have been the subject of State concern and action for nearly fifty years. And since the founding of the Division of Housing in 1913 as the Commission of Immigration and Housing, we have come a long way in improving the housing conditions of California's agricultural workers. I take some pride in the fact that many of the important accomplishments in this field have taken place under this Administration.

STATE HOUSING LAW - Under the new State Housing Law passed by the 1961 Legislature, we have for the first time in history the basic tool necessary to apply uniform building and performance standards for the construction and alteration of hotels, apartments and private dwellings on a statewide basis. These State standards, applicable to all buildings used for human habitation, constitute one of the basic tools we have needed to halt the spread of rural slums and substandard urban fringe communities in the unincorporated areas of the State. Not only is this tool basic to halting the spread of these communities, it is basic to any effort to rehabilitate or redevelop them.

LABOR CAMP REGISTRATION - In the field of labor camp legislation, it became mandatory this year for all operators of labor camps to register such camps with the Division of Housing each year. This marks the culmination of an effort that dates back to the beginnings of the Division of Housing itself and will greatly enhance our ability to encourage the maintenance of minimum standards in labor camps. It also will enable us to better serve the growers who operate camps through providing them with advice and planning assistance prior to the construction of new camps or the alteration of existing camps. This has long been needed, for shortcomings in labor camps are in many cases the result of a lack of knowledge rather than of any intention to provide substandard housing.

In addition to these basic and important legislative gains, the Division of Housing since last August has been engaged in a comprehensive study of the family housing needs of California's agricultural workers. We intend to continue this study as part of the broad program of the Governor's Advisory Commission on Housing Problems, and to submit our report and recommendations before the end of 1962.

In all of this we have benefited greatly from an increased cooperation from the agricultural industry itself. We have received much sound advice and assistance both from individual growers and grower organizations, and we are proud of the confidence they have shown in us. Those of us who are vitally interested in the housing problems of the agricultural worker and his family must look on these steps toward progress with mixed emotions. For there is much yet to be done, and for all the progress that has been made the basic problems have yet to be met.

Today, the housing needs of the agricultural worker and his family are as critical as they were 20 years ago and, in some respects, little less urgent than they were during the 1930's when thousands of displaced families from the middle and southwestern states were attracted to California by the heavy labor requirements of its diversified agricultural industry. As in the past, these unmet needs are reflected in an acute shortage of employer-provided seasonal housing for families who move with the crops and with the continued growth of urban fringe areas and rural slums in the agricultural sections of the State. The shortage of employer-provided

housing for families and the growth of rural shack towns are closely related problems. Neither are new problems. Both are deeply rooted in the economic history and tradition of the agricultural industry in California.

The migrant from the middle and southwest, uprooted from the land by drought, mechanization and a depression economy, came upon an agricultural industry in California whose labor patterns had already been set by a heavy dependence on alien single workers. Nowhere was this more evident than in the problem of housing. For although the State of California had early begun to enforce minimum standards in labor camps, the agricultural industry was totally unprepared for a large influx of workers whose needs exceeded the simple facilities necessary for the housing of single men.

In 1939 the Division of Housing made a special report to the Governor on the housing conditions of agricultural workers. At that time, the Division divided enforcement responsibility between three Area Offices, the Northern, Central and Southern. Of the descriptions in the 1939 report, the most detailed came from the Supervisor of the Northern Area, which contained 27 counties, including Sutter, Yuba, Yolo, Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties where most of the agricultural camps were located. The report of the Northern Area cited 12 major crops which made use of large numbers of seasonal workers. Of these, seven were reported dominated by single men, mostly aliens. With but one exception, the facilities for single men consisted of permanent frame buildings and were rated either "good" or "fair". In all instances, the few facilities available for families consisted of so-called "outfit" camps, where the family was expected to provide its own tent and camping equipment, or of employer-furnished tent camps. The family camps were rated by the Division's inspectors as from "bad" to "fair".

Today, nearly 23 years after the Division's 1939 report, the outlines of the problem have hardly changed. Conditions in all labor camps, of course, are considerably better. But generally speaking, the housing offered the single man is superior to that offered the family. Quantitatively, the percentage of employer-provided housing for families is small and there is evidence that it has been growing smaller. Of the approximately 6,500 agricultural labor camps of Division record in 1959, facilities were available for 230,300 single men, primarily foreign contract workers. For the same year, Division records list facilities for only 17,100 families.

In 1939, the Division estimated there were 1,682 agricultural labor camps in the major crop areas of the Northern Area, primarily Sacramento, San Joaquin, Yolo, Yuba and Sutter Counties. In 1959, the camps of Division record for these counties totalled 1,436. Of these, facilities available for single men far outnumbered those for families. In Sacramento County, Division records indicated facilities available for 6,733 single men, 177 families; San Joaquin County, now part of the Central Area, 30,914 singles and 226 families; Yolo County, which once attracted many migrant families, 12,364 singles and 72 families; Yuba County, 2,726 singles and 129 families; Sutter County, 10,333 singles and 191 families.

Monterey County, with facilities for 18,715 singles, reported in 1959, had housing for only 522 families; Santa Clara County, 6,674 singles, 520 families; Imperial County, once an important link in the migrant cycle, 17,990 singles and only 30 families; Riverside County, 19,975 singles, 1,145 families; San Bernardino County, 2,432 singles and 196 families; San Diego 5,936 singles and 107 families.

In Fresno, Kern and Kings Counties, where highly diversified farming requires heavy amounts of labor nearly year around, the disparity is somewhat smaller. Fresno County had facilities of record in 1959 for 7,810 singles and 3,553 families; Kern for 6,169 singles, 2,335 families; Kings for 1,288 singles and 720 families.

Tabulation of labor camp registrations for this year indicate so far that while there will probably be an overall decline in the amount of on-farm housing reported for both single men and families, the disparity between single and family housing will remain.

This lengthy review of history and statistics contains an important lesson regarding the traditional approach to the family housing problem. In the past, many of us have too often acted as though, simply by condemning the grower for not providing family housing, we can override all his economic considerations and objections and bring such housing into being as though by miracle.

I am in complete agreement with the general proposition that it is to the grower's advantage to provide good housing because it enhances his ability to recruit good workers. Indeed, the grower accepts this general proposition in providing increasingly fine housing for his permanent, year-around workers.

But I think there is considerable question on the part of the grower as to whether under present conditions it is to his advantage to provide housing for families who work on a seasonal basis. Certainly he has little incentive to do so if he may obtain single men through the Mexican National Program.

From the grower's point of view, single men's barracks are considerably more efficient to operate even when mess hall facilities are required. Every occupied bed in a single men's camp equals one worker. No such one-to-one ratio prevails in seasonal family housing when a family of five may yield but one or two workers. And there are hundreds of instances throughout the State where the hutments and cabins once available to that family of five are now set aside for the housing of five single men.

I have not cited these considerations as an apology for the grower's reluctance to provide housing for families nor even as a condemnation of his preference for single, foreign workers, although the adverse effects of the Mexican National Program are nowhere more apparent than in the problem of housing for migrant families. But it would seem that it is mistaken for any of us to believe that we can turn back the tide of history simply by providing low interest mortgage money as an incentive for the construction of on-farm family housing for seasonals.

We need a comprehensive, well thought out program that goes beyond on-farm housing. We need a program which takes into account both the needs of the grower for a reliable work force and the needs of the worker for stability and reliability of income. Furthermore, we need a program that takes into account the fact that most of the family housing for agricultural workers in California is not being provided on the farm but in shack towns and fringe communities.

With our present knowledge it is impossible to assess statistically the extent to which the disparity between single and family on-farm housing affects the domestic work force. Our own experience would lead us to estimate that at least half and perhaps as much as two-thirds of the 17,100 family units of record in 1959 were in use by permanent ranch workers and therefore not available to the nonlocal seasonal domestic work force. Although we believe that the migrant seasonal work force, of from 29,700 to 47,500 persons, is in large part families, we are not able to estimate with any accuracy how many. Nor would such an estimate have any value beyond that of a purely illustrative statistical comparison, for the critical problem is not one of direct relationship between the number of family units available and total demand but whether sufficient family housing exists in specific areas when specific demand arises. Here, some evidence is available as a result of a study just completed by the Division of the remaining farm labor centers which were established by the Federal Government in the late 1930's and early 1940's as a partial solution to the family housing shortage for agricultural workers.

Of the 21 original centers, only 18 remain and only 12 can be said to be serving seasonal workers and their families. The facilities at these centers have deteriorated to the extent that they will probably have to be closed in the near future. However, during 1960 they housed nearly 3,000 families for various periods of time. Depending on size, the centers with seasonal facilities house from 50 to 175 families during peak harvest periods. Occupancy loads are directly related to labor needs, and at several centers hundreds of families are turned away during a single month of harvest activity because sufficient facilities are not available. In 1960 the management of the Gridley Center, in Butte County, turned away 150 families during the August peach harvest; the Firebaugh Center, in Fresno County, had to reject an estimated 75 families during its peak occupancy period in June; Wasco, in Kern County, turned away 267 families during the potato harvest in May and June; Indio estimates it turns away an average of six families a day during peak crop activity in Riverside County; and Richland, in Sutter County, reports turning away 440 families during the August peach harvest. Many of these families find substandard rental housing in fringe areas and shack towns in the surrounding area, many simply camp on the ditchbanks.

Thus, not only do the farm labor centers constitute a significant source of housing for the family agricultural worker--a source of housing certain to be removed --but in many instances they reflect a critical shortage of such housing.

The fringe community plays a far more important role, however, in providing housing for much of both the permanent and seasonal local work force and in functioning as a home base for a large portion of those families who find it necessary to leave home during the summer harvest season to find work.

In 1950 the Division of Housing conducted a random sampling in 181 selected communities in Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, Stanislaus and Tulare Counties. The estimated number of substandard dwellings found in this limited sampling totaled 25,566. Thirty-six of these communities were in incorporated areas, 53 were in fringes of incorporated areas and 92 were in rural unincorporated areas. In 112 communities, pit toilets were the predominant type of sanitary facility. Dilapidation, lack of adequate or sanitary water supply and overcrowding were common problems in these communities.

A subtabulation of inspection reports for approximately five per cent of the dwelling in communities in which most dwellings were substandard revealed that overall 57 per cent of the occupants were agricultural workers. By dwelling type, agricultural workers accounted for 55 per cent of the occupants of houses, 65 per cent of the occupants of trailers, 82 per cent of the occupants of tents and 76 per cent of the shack occupants.

In the face of this, it is difficult to understand the contention we have heard many times that the occupancy in these communities has no relation to the agricultural labor problem, that the people who live in these communities are in some kind of occupational limbo.

It would seem to be inescapable that the problem of urban fringe areas and rural slums in the valley, with all their ramifications in terms of general community health and future planning, cannot be understood apart from the special problems of the agricultural worker and his family. His income, his mobility, the manner in which he now obtains his housing, and the way in which that housing functions for him in terms of placing him in reach of employment opportunity, all have an important bearing on what kinds of programs will be required to alleviate these critical housing problems.

We need to know more about the rental and ownership patterns in these communities and about the way in which these communities function within the framework of California's agricultural labor needs.

Gaining this knowledge, we need to explore new kinds of solutions to the agricultural worker's housing problems--programs which include providing incentives through low interest loans on an individual basis but which go beyond this in taking into account the complex nature of the problems they are intended to alleviate.

Beyond this, we need support in developing such programs and we need this support especially from the agricultural industry itself. Indeed, the industry is capable of providing more than support--it can, if it will, provide leadership.

I mentioned earlier that we have found an increased interest and cooperation from the industry in regard to housing problems. I think it would be tragic if for any reason that interest is either withdrawn or ceases to grow. We have an unprecedented opportunity not only to develop long-range programs for improving the housing of the agricultural work force, but also to improve the quality of that work force itself and bring some order and efficiency into the manner in which it is used. It will be to our shame if we miss this opportunity.

Thank you.

MIGRANT CHILDREN IN CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS

By
Helen Heffernan, Chief, Bureau of Elementary Education
California Department of Education

For many years the migrant children have come and gone throughout the State of California from the prunes--to the nuts--to the cotton, the lettuce and the carrots--and their comings and goings have been a source of great concern to California's educators. Hundreds of men and women have devoted their lives to teaching these girls and boys and to improving educational conditions for them. I have known and worked with many of these people--in fact I established the first school for migrant children on the Boston Land Company ranch in Kings County. The many school people in this audience bear evidence that this interest and concern for the welfare of California's children who move with the crops continue to the present time.

Changes have come through the years and one of the most spectacular has been in school housing. When California made funds available to local districts for capital outlay, the way was open to provide quality housing for all children everywhere in the State. Most of the schools serving migrant children have taken advantage of this legislation. Housing for families continues to be a serious problem, but the children of seasonal agricultural workers can attend school in attractive modern buildings.

The federally-supported school lunch program has made a hot nutritious noonday meal available to all. Again many schools serving migrants have taken advantage of this opportunity to improve health and to provide one of the basic conditions for learning. The fact that "you can't teach hungry children" is well accepted today. It was not always so.

The publication Teaching Children Who Move With The Crops, a project of the Fresno County Schools under a grant from the Rosenberg Foundation has had great influence on the improvement of the curriculum in these schools. The Teacher's Guide to the Education of Spanish-speaking Children, a publication of the Bureau of Elementary Education, has also been widely and effectively used.

Although much has been done through the years--much still remains to be done--now and in the years ahead. The number of seasonal farm workers has decreased because of mechanization, and, as a result, the problem has lessened in extent but it has not changed in character. Problems arising from adverse social and economic conditions affecting the children are largely unchanged. A survey of 80 school districts serving migrant children was made in the spring of 1961 by my co-worker Mrs. Afton Dill Nance, Consultant in Elementary Education of the Bureau of Elementary Education. Persons responding to the questionnaire on which the survey was based made frequent mention of the detrimental effects of poor physical and mental health, of sporadic attendance, of constant adjustment to new teachers and classmates, and of general insecurity and frustration. These factors make the achievement of a desirable educational program extremely difficult if not impossible. Educational leaders in schools serving migrants also face problems of obtaining fully qualified teachers, of supplying appropriate school housing, of providing a full day's instruction for all pupils, and of maintaining classes of teachable size. Data presented in the report from 80 school districts indicated that these schools employ 6.6 percent more teachers who are not fully qualified than the percent for such employment throughout the State. Twenty-five percent of the districts stated that their school housing was not adequate. Twenty-seven and a half percent maintain half-day sessions for one or more classrooms, as

against 8.6 percent in the State as a whole--a difference of 18.9 percent. During the period of high enrollment, class size in 87 percent of the districts is over 25. In groups of this size, the individual instruction needed to help these children succeed, cannot be given.

Many of these problems are common to all California schools during this period of rapid growth. However, if schools serving migrants share problems with other districts, they also benefit from the same legislation which guarantees educational opportunity to all children--basic State Aid and equalization. The group of schools serving migrants reported the differences in assessed valuation and in local tax rate which are common throughout the State. Let us look at a few of these differences among the migrant schools. One such school in Fresno County has an assessed valuation of $191,824 per ADA and a tax rate of $.10--its neighbor, also in Fresno County, has an assessed valuation per ADA of $8,168 and a tax rate of $1.73. Those oil fields make the difference!

Other figures from the survey indicate a wide range of financial resources from the lush $191,824 mentioned before down to a district in Yuba County with an assessed valuation per ADA of $2,541 and a tax rate of $1.13. Legislation introduced into the last session of the Legislature under the sponsorship of the State Department of Education was planned to correct these inequities. The bills increased the amount of State support for educational purposes from approximately 50 percent to about 70 percent and also made the county instead of the district the basis for the collection and disbursement of local taxes. The bills were defeated; but this is a democracy, and we can try again when the problem is more generally understood.

Federal legislation is under consideration at the present time. Public Law 1124 has passed the Senate and is now before the House. This education bill, if passed, would establish a four-part five-year program of federal assistance to state and local communities seriously affected by the seasonal impact of migratory families. It is difficult to state just what this legislation, if passed, would mean to California. The survey cited previously showed increases in the enrollment during the year 1959-60 of 8,376 children. Let us assume that most of this increased school enrollment was due to the arrival of migrant workers, and that the figure is reasonably accurate. If one multiplies this figure by $395.39, the average amount spent annually for the education of each elementary school child, he arrives at a figure of some $3,010,000. Information on what passage of this law would mean for secondary schools or for adult education is not available. Certainly provisions in the law for state and interstate planning and coordination of educational problems would be most important and in accordance with established policy, would be fully utilized in California.

The proposed federal legislation also includes a provision to encourage summer schools. California can establish these schools under state support at the present time. However, only 22 of the 80 school districts reporting in the survey held summer schools in 1961. The Bureau of Elementary Education which now has the responsibility of approving summer school programs hopes to encourage their establishment in 1962 and to be able to provide consultant services to aid schools in planning vital and challenging programs. In certain areas, migrant workers are employed during the summer only. Children and parents may not be informed regarding the possibility of attendance, and must often be encouraged to participate. Members of the Migrant Ministry and the American Friends Service Committee have many personal contacts in the camps and have been of great assistance in recruiting pupils for summer schools during the last few years. Their assistance is valuable and should be fully utilized.

Although exact figures are not available most of the migrant children are retarded at least a year in school achievement. One superintendent wrote as follows: "Most of the children have to spend at least one extra year in the elementary grades not because of lack of ability, but because of loss of time due to transfers. Lack of morale and enthusiasm for school become a problem in the upper grades, as pupils drop farther and farther behind their classmates." Differences in curriculum and in guidance practices in the different schools attended further complicate this problem.

An increasing number of migrant children come from homes where English is not the native language. These children have special educational problems. Recent interest in teaching foreign language in the elementary schools has made a body of research available which may eventually help in the solution of this problem. It has been common practice to "give them a year to learn English." After this year, children who speak Spanish at home are expected to do about the same school work as English-speaking children and are often classified as "retarded" if they are not successful. Language experts tell us that learning a foreign language in school requires an unbroken sequence of eight or ten years of study. Since English is used all day, Spanish-speaking children in our schools would probably not need so long a sequence to learn English, but schools should study the possibility of providing opportunities for planned, sequential study of English using audio-lingual methods and modern materials and equipment for Spanish-speaking children throughout the primary and middle grades.

In the field of curriculum the need is to improve methods of individual instruction. At the present time this field is receiving great attention because it points the way to more effective learning for all children. The 1962 Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education is on Individualizing Instruction. I commend it for your study. In many schools, programs in the social studies, in music and in art should be greatly strengthened. The migrant children need extension of experience rather than excessive amounts of drill on material which is only partially understood.

The child labor and school attendance laws should be rigorously enforced. School attendance officers are not employed to interpret the law, but to enforce it. Laws relating to work permits and regulations regarding hours and types of employment may need to be reviewed from time to time as new personnel is employed. I recognized that at times drastic action must be taken to get and keep migrant children in school. We are being told on all sides that few opportunities for unskilled workers now exist and that fewer will exist in the future. These girls and boys cannot acquire marketable vocational skills without a good basic education in the elementary schools. If necessary, let drastic action be taken, but get and keep the children in school.

The migrants are settling down and children's school attendance can be more regular, but problems of irregular employment and poor housing continue. Many families have settled down because work opportunities are no longer available elsewhere. In fact the family earnings may well be reduced and the financial situation more insecure than it was when they followed the crops. Aside from a few jobs as irrigators and tractor workers no full-time employment opportunities are available for agricultural workers. This is not the problem facing this conference but it is a matter of grave concern to many educators, and will require study and constructive action in the future.

In review let five children from the Kettleman City Elementary School of the Reef-Sunset School District in Kings County speak to you through their teachers. These are case histories submitted as part of a study of educational programs

which is now being carried on in a selected group of elementary schools in Fresno, Kings, Imperial and Santa Clara Counties.

We shall hear from Maria, Oliver, Mike, Salvador and Luis.

Maria - Grade 2: Maria was born in Abernathy, Texas almost nine years ago. Her parents are of Mexican descent. Her father went to school in Mexico and Spanish is spoken in the home.

Maria did not go to kindergarten, but attended first grade in Texas. She spent 55 days in second grade in Edcouch-Elsa School District. From what I can gather she did not attend school again during that year. She then went to Walnut Grove, California for a short while. Then she remained out of school for a long time. She next went to Huron, California for a "couple of weeks." Another extended absence followed this. Finally she came to Kettleman City where she's been for fourteen school days.

When she came here I asked her to select a book she wanted to read with me. The first day she started looking at the second grade books, but she didn't choose one. The next day I asked again and was told that she was "looking!" Finally the third day she chose a first pre-primer which she can read with some difficulty.

Maria can do some easy arithmetic, but she does not know the word color names, how to make the letters, or how to play games. She is afraid to play with the children, but will try if encouraged to do so. Maria is a hard working studious child, and tries very hard to do things correctly. I feel certain that if her school attendance had been more regular she would be achieving at grade level.

Oliver - Grade 3: Oliver entered our school from Sandy, Oregon. He had attended five schools prior to attending the Sandy School.

For about a month I thought Oliver's school work was poor because he was uncommunicative. As Oliver became interested in modeling with plastacine he began to talk to me. I discovered he had read a great deal. Gradually he began talking in class, doing good work in language, spelling and reading. His arithmetic is up to grade level now. If I had had a large class and inadequate materials Oliver probably would have been lost "in the shuffle."

Oliver has two brothers and one sister in our school. They all were unhappy and unfriendly at first. They all enjoy our school activities and work now.

Last week Oliver offered to sing a solo at a school program and he did well.

Mike - Grade 3: Mike has attended Kettleman City School for three years. Records show that Mike enters school in October, attends regularly for the most part, with a month's break in February when the family returns to their native country - Old Mexico. About the first of March he returns and sometimes stays the year out, but oftener he leaves a month early.

Mike, born in Weslaco, Texas, has a top achievement in arithmetic of 4.4 and low in reading of 2.6. The IQ is .80 verbal and 102 nonverbal. Former records indicate, that "Mike works and plays with enthusiasm, and is well liked by his peer group. He enjoys his school work." This is true at the present time when Mike is in the third grade.

He likes to take books home (at his own reading level) and takes pride in carrying the "Weekly Reader," home "for his father to read," he says.

His parents are in their early thirties. Mike has two brothers and three sisters.

The entire family portrays a picture of industry, diligence, and thriftiness at the highest level of achievement. They are clean in person and in their home. The parents visit school and show great interest and affection for their children.

Salvador - Grade 4: Salvador lives in a small house which is in poor condition. He lives in Kettleman City from November to May. The family makes its living picking and chopping cotton. In May the family moves to San Jose or Hollister, California. They pick fruit in that area.

In an interview with Salvador he stated that he enjoys traveling with his family and looks forward to spending the summer in the San Jose area.

Salvador comes to school in old but clean clothes. He is a little shy but is well liked by his peers. He takes part in all of the school's activities. He is a member of the school's glee club. He enjoys sports and shows signs of good artistic ability. Once he enters school in the fall his attendance is excellent.

Salvador, a fourth grader, is below grade level in his school work. He is low in reading and language. His slowness in these subjects may be due to his environment. Spanish is the language used at home. During the summer he has little opportunity to speak English because most of his friends also speak Spanish. His family shows little interest in his school work. This lack of interest is due to the fact that the mother has to work much of the time and she speaks very little English herself. Salvador is a willing worker and is very cooperative.

Luis - Grade 6: Luis comes from a home where Spanish is spoken rather than English. His father is a farm laborer. Luis first came to Kettleman City in February 1960 when he was eleven years old. He transferred from the Relampago School, Mercedes, Texas. He had been enrolled there 30 days and absent none. He had been in the second grade and his grades indicated that he was in the lower group of his class. His grades were F's and D's in all subjects except music. The following comment was noted on his withdrawal form: "Luis is a very slow student and does not show any interest." Because of his age, Luis was placed in the fifth grade at Kettleman City. He was enrolled for the remainder of the year, 82 days, and absent two days.

Luis came to Kettleman City again this year on January 16. Again he transferred from the Relampago School where he had been enrolled 27 days, absent two. He had been in the third grade. He was placed in the 6th grade here and has remained in that room to the present time. He has been absent one day so far.

Over the past two years there seems to have been a definite pattern of migration in this family. In the fall the family has gone to Monterey, Mexico where a grandmother lives. Late in November the children have been enrolled in the Relampago School where they have stayed until late January or early February. Then they have moved to Kettleman City, losing about a week in attendance between the two schools. They have stayed here until the end of the year, then returned to Texas during the summer.

The father seems to be a general farm laborer, although Luis did mention that in Texas the father worked with the tractors. At the Calflax Ranch where they stay here, he has worked as an irrigator.

I would not agree with the comment that Luis shows no interest. As a matter of fact, he has shown great interest in activities where he can participate effectively such as art, some social studies activities, and choral reading. The difficulty is that practically all instruction has to be on an individual basis since his academic ability is so far below average in the class. He does not understand English very well when it is spoken in a group situation. Things have to be explained to him very carefully and in simple terms.

On the playground and in the classroom Luis associates almost entirely with other Spanish-speaking children, and most of their conversation is carried on in Spanish.

These stories of real children describe the problems of the present and hold out the promise of the future.

Our deliberations at this conference and our actions when we return to our homes will make the difference.

I would like to suggest some specific goals which this conference might endorse in order that this promise be fulfilled.

1. Passage of laws on the State and Federal levels which extend the protection of social legislation available to most Americans to seasonal agricultural laborers--this includes minimum wage, unemployment insurance and Social Security. In addition training and opportunities for year-round employment should be provided. This is in accordance with President Kennedy's recommendations to Congress in his State of the Union Message. The educational problems of the children cannot be solved so long as their parents live economically underprivileged and poverty-stricken lives in the midst of our nation's plenty. No group of citizens in this nation should be forced to rely on private charity or funds from public welfare to eke out a meager living.

Progress would be made toward achieving these ends by the passage in the House of Representatives of five bills which have already passed the Senate. These five measures[1] deal with child labor (S.1123); education (S.1124); labor contractor (or crew leader) registration (S.1126); health services (S.1130) and an advisory council on migratory labor (S.1132).

2. Passage of State legislation which would further equalize educational opportunities for the children in California's schools.

3. Funds which would permit school districts or county offices to employ social workers to serve the adult migrants.

4. Strict enforcement of child labor and school attendance laws.

5. Extension of opportunities for migrant children to attend a summer school in which the curriculum has been planned to meet their needs.

6. Extension of the provisions of the National Defense Education Act to include teaching English as a foreign language. This would benefit the many migrant children who come from homes where Spanish is spoken.

These actions can only be taken by people who care--people to whom Maria and Oliver and their friends are important.

---

[1]Migratory Labor Notes. The President's Committee on Migratory Labor. Washington, D.C.: No. 14. November, 1961, Page 3.

PLANNING FOR RURAL CALIFORNIA

By
Elton R. Andrews, Director, Office of Planning
California Department of Finance

There is a direct connection between the problems of the "Families Who Follow the Crops" and the State Planning Program.

It is not my intention to dwell on the problems of the farm worker. We all know what they are. We must ask ourselves, however, will these problems solve themselves or must we continue to work for programs that will improve the working conditions of the farm laborer--itinerant or not? Some authorities appear to take the position that the solution to the farm labor problem is to eliminate the need for farm labor by a revision of our agricultural economy to a structure of only small farm units, which then--it is postulated--would require only the labor of the farmer-owner. It seems to me that this approach is highly unrealistic. With our specialty crops indigenous to California, it doesn't seem to me that smaller farm units would, in fact, eliminate the need for farm labor. I believe that California's growing conditions and mechanization will continue to generate pressures for large-scale agriculture in this State. Mechanization will, of course, lead to a reduction in the required agricultural labor force. But this does nothing to solve the problems of the families and people who remain a part of the agricultural economy. What is needed, I believe, is a stabilization of agricultural land use and the position of the agricultural worker in the community. This is not intended as a panacea for all of the problems of agriculture and the farm laborer. If we could stabilize the amount of land devoted to agriculture, remove the threat of urbanization from our best agricultural lands, and reduce the shifts in agricultural land use caused by urban encroachment, we could go a long way toward the stabilization of the agricultural labor force in spite of the inroads of mechanization and competition from other industries.

With a stable labor force, many of the State programs designed to improve the situation of the farm worker would be more successful. Agriculture is often referred to as California's most important industry. If this is so, labor in this industry deserves the same status as labor in any other industry.

The State Office of Planning has four major functions: Preparation, maintenance, and periodic revision of a State development plan; coordination of public works programs undertaken by State agencies; provision of planning assistance to local, district and regional planning agencies; and staff assistance to the Governor and Director of Finance on matters affecting physical growth and development.

The Government code provides that the State development plan shall include recommendations for the most desirable general pattern of land use and circulation within the State, and for the most desirable use and development of land resources of the State, all considered in respect to: The need to conserve and develop special types of land and water resources of state-wide significance, including areas specifically suited for agriculture, forestry, mining, recreation, and fish and wild life.

Why is there an urgent need for a comprehensive State development plan? It has been wisely said that most current governmental action is more influenced by the future than the past. Nowhere is this more evident than in the plans and programs of the State Government and of the 5,000 units of local government--cities, counties, and special districts. California's developmental problems are the

prime reason for this unparalleled program of action. In the aggregate, all of the levels of government are spending several billions of dollars yearly for developmental programs. Those physical development problems having state-wide significance are the responsibility of State planning. State planning in California has meaning because it will contribute effectively to the solution of these problems. Their scale--in whatever terms one chooses to use--requires a comprehensive approach to bring about sound solutions.

In its broadest sense, State Planning means bringing a comprehensive viewpoint to bear upon the major physical development problems of the State, upon their interrelationships, and upon the many programs designed and administered to solve these problems. The State development plan will comprise a comprehensive, long range, general set of recommendations for the orderly, coordinated growth and development of California. It will be based upon continuing studies of physical, social, and economic conditions and trends and take into account the plans of local governments and those of private enterprise, having state-wide significance.

If the position of agriculture and agricultural labor is to be stabilized within the State's economy, clearly agriculture must be a prime element of the State development plan. Increasing attention has been paid in recent years to the way in which California's best agricultural lands are being transformed into nonagricultural use. Concern is felt for the manner as well as the extent of the process. Frequently referred to as "scatterization" to describe the way in which urban development has invaded agricultural areas.

Encroachment on "prime lands" has attracted the attention of farmers, planners, legislators, and academicians alike. Most manifestations of this interest to date have converged on a common objective: The preservation of agricultural resources. The conservation of prime farm lands cannot be separated from many larger land use and development considerations. One of the difficulties surrounding the solution of the problem is the failure to understand that the problem can only be approached fruitfully in terms of the broader setting. It is not merely a matter of aiding the farmer who wishes to resist the on-rush of the subdividers and the dictates of the assessor. Neither is it only a matter of somehow providing a neater method of urbanization. These and other aspects of the broad land use problem pose real and serious challenges. They are all interrelated.

Virtually all modern efforts to devise a new urban form presuppose extensive open areas, whether they are explicitly termed, "greenbelts", or not. It might, in fact, be said that the most controversial aspect of contemporary planning revolves around the determination of the amount of "openness" appropriate for both the core and environs of the modern metropolitan area. There is also a demand to redress the appallingly apparent deficiencies in public open spaces of all kinds and sizes.

Too frequently these desires fail to examine the larger development situation. The result is that even as our metropolitan areas consume greater amounts of land at their boundaries, the space needs of their citizens are projected upon rural areas--often several hundred miles away. This type of metropolitan growth and development calls for a comprehensive land use plan and a state-wide development policy--not alone in the interests of agriculture or lumbering, but in the interests of these urban millions themselves. Their welfare depends in ever greater degree upon a proper balance between the traditional urban uses and those involving our farms, forests, and grazing areas.

Special planning studies need to be made for agriculture and forestry. These must complement other land use studies carried out by the State Office of

Planning: Analysis of the expansion of existing metropolitan areas and projection of alternative patterns of urban development for presently undeveloped portions of our State likely to undergo urbanization during the next several decades.

Since recreational needs are greatest within a 30-50 mile range of metropolitan areas, these demands will exert pressures on agricultural lands both in the immediate vicinity of our population centers and on some of the foothill lands which might serve agricultural uses displaced from the valleys. There is a definite and obvious opportunity to merge recreation and other programs for the purpose of providing a new type of open space--one which conceivably might include substantial amounts of land reserved for agricultural use as well.

There is a considerable area of disagreement as to whether agriculture--as a land use--ought not to be replaced by more intensive uses strictly on the basis of conventional real estate economics. In some ways, this argument has paralleled the often heated debate over "community values" versus highway "user benefits".

Both arguments arise because they involve the measurement, in greater or lesser degree, of intangibles and of truly social costs. If, as has been predicted, up to half of our best cropland is pre-empted by urban development in the next 20-25 years, there are many developmental consequences which cannot be rationalized in purely fiscal terms.

Will improvements in food technology and agricultural science compensate for the likely increase in costs (and possible decline in quality) attributable to the fact that fruit and vegetables will move greater distances between the grower and consumer? What will be the effect on the broad mass of farmers forced to make new and higher capital investments in order to extract higher yields from smaller farms on poorer soils. Is there a responsibility toward the families, organizations, and communities disrupted by uncontrolled urban expansion? Can we (finally) literally afford the super-metropolis already forecast for California--vast urban concentrations which will have swallowed up the remaining valleys of the Bay Region and the Los Angeles Basin; which will have established a continuous urban swath from Marysville to Bakersfield and from Santa Barbara to San Diego? It is possible to have such urban development: The question is whether it is desirable.

It is in answering these questions that we begin to perceive the outline of the case for conserving prime agricultural lands. It is, in fact, difficult to imagine accommodating more people than already live in California on a humane basis, without presupposing the physical and psychological relief afforded by many of our present agricultural areas.

Agricultural use, it is clear, presents a unique method for satisfying a part of man's essential need for contact with the natural environment. Peculiarly, the most fruitful and economically justifiable agricultural endeavors occur, generally, in closest proximity to existing and emergent metropolitan areas. In conserving these valuable croplands, then, there is accomplished a variety of socially valuable objectives at minimum public expense--if <u>all</u> costs are taken into consideration.

Moreover, it is possible to delineate rather precisely the best agricultural lands thereby concentrating conservation efforts on a minimum area with maximum return, while concurrently stabilizing the investment in irrigation, processing,

and related facilities. Further, these top-quality farm lands occur in great enough extent to form the anchor for other, predominantly recreational uses: Enhancing the recreational lands through the contiguity of the additional space and through the interest afforded urban inhabitants by the agricultural environment.

I have said, in effect, that in order to stabilize agricultural land use and the position of the agricultural worker in the community, we must have a State development plan and that open space--including agricultural lands--is an essential element of the development plan. State and federal projects must be coordinated and carried out in accordance with the plan. It makes no sense to plan for a continuation and intensification of agricultural use by development of irrigation facilities and then to build a freeway through the middle, disrupting the agricultural economy and inducing the urban development the plan would avoid.

The responsibility to plan in detail for the growth and development of the area within their boundaries lies with the cities and counties. We hope they will use the State development plan as a guideline--a framework within which to develop their own plans. Adjustments will have to be made to meet local desires and needs.

It is the cities and counties that have the responsibility to zone and control subdivision development. Sound county development, achieved through broad, well-conceived county planning programs, is essential if stability in the agricultural economy and community is to be achieved. A sound tax base, related to the agricultural industry and appropriate commercial development, is required if agricultural counties are to provide the health, welfare, and educational services deserved by agricultural laborers and their families.

The cities in the agricultural areas also have an important responsibility to plan for the future. After all, development within their corporate boundaries is an important part of the county tax base. But, more important, as farm workers adopt one community or another as their "home base" (and this they must be encouraged to do if they are to become stabilized in the community), they and their families must find available housing they can afford, and they will demand and deserve city services appropriate to their needs and ability to pay. This may sound like a prospective strain on the finances of small cities in the agricultural areas, but sound planning and capital budgeting will make the job easier and less a burden to the taxpayer. At all costs, the continued relegation of the farm family to substandard, blighted housing on the fringes of our agricultural cities must be avoided. Where it has happened already, it is a disgrace. I am happy to say that through the use of the urban renewal program and other federal housing aids, projects are under way to correct some mistakes of the past. But this is far from enough. Much more effective programs must be developed and in the immediate future. Doing the right thing may seem costly at the time, but the correction of past mistakes is usually even more costly.

In summary: The State Development Plan will provide a basis for the protection and stabilization of agricultural land and the agriculture industry.

Agricultural land must be preserved--not only to preserve the agricultural economy, but to preserve open space for its own value in a highly urbanized society.

Federal, State, and local public works programs must be coordinated to avoid destroying the benefits of one program with the effects of another.

City and county planning is essential if the State Development Plan is to be carried out and if the cities and counties are to be able to provide housing, education, and other essential services to the farm worker.

Only in these ways can the families who follow the crops become stabilized in the community.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT MOVES TO IMPROVE SERVICES TO AGRICULTURAL MIGRANTS

By
Margot Wakeman Lenhart, Farm Placement Supervisor
California Department of Employment

In March, 1961, the Director of the California Department of Employment announced a new registration policy and procedure. This was to offer every farm job seeker the chance to register and have work records maintained by employment offices in the California areas in which he works. What does this mean to the farm worker in general and the migrant in particular?

A major part of our Department's farm job filling used to be what we called "spot placement". If the worker came into the farm labor office when acceptable work was available, he might be sent out on the spot--without formal registration. The only record of him might be his name on the back of the employer's order, to show who was sent. If he was referred to day-haul employment, there would probably not even be a record of his name. He might be one of several men referred to the employer's bus.

Under the new policy and procedure, we ask the worker to register--whether he can be placed on the spot or not--and whether he is a local resident or a migrant. We ask him to tell us his qualifications, work experience, and skills at different farm tasks. We make note of related job factors--such as transportation needed or housing for his family. Then, on the registration or application card, we keep a record of the results of his referral. This is the employer's report on the worker's performance and reliability. Once, good reports begin to accumulate on the worker's record, more job offers seem to come his way. Sometimes, such a worker who has engaged only in casual or seasonal employment in the past finds himself offered a good permanent job. So, one significant result of the registration procedure is that we are often able to provide the worker with more seasonal work, or a permanent job--either of which extends his employment and the opportunity to increase his earnings.

Through urging employers to report back to our office on each worker referred, we think we have stimulated a new interest in the individual worker by the employer. We see encouraging indications that this may also be carrying over to restore more personal employer-employee relationships on the job.

We often note that the worker, aware that he now has a work record, seems interested in making it a good record. Quite a number take care to come in and explain to us why they left a certain job for good cause, or to inquire if the employer whose job was finished had sent in a report.

For the migrant, the registration and work record offers new recognition. Instead of always being a stranger, he can now come into a farm labor office and say "I'm Joe Migrant. I registered when I worked in peaches here last year. You have my record in your file." This record enables the employment office interviewer to feel that he knows him, get him onto a job faster and with confidence regarding his qualifications. The record also shows the employer he worked for last year, and who would want him back because of the good report on his performance. Joe Migrant may have work records in offices in several California areas where he has worked, and he knows he will be welcomed back when he returns to those offices.

From the viewpoint of the employer, the registration policy is reportedly bringing him better workers, who are staying on the job longer and giving evidence of greater work interest. This is partly because we can do a better job of selection, knowing more about the worker--and partly because of the worker's desire for a good record.

These benefits are not yet widespread or generally conspicuous, but the encouraging indications are there, and the potential labor market advantages are greater stabilization and more complete utilization of the domestic farm work force. This serves the best interests of both employers and workers, and this is the objective of the Department of Employment.

Agricultural migrants also receive a highly specialized service at offices of the Department of Employment. Each year the Department is giving greater emphasis to the program known as the Annual Worker Plan. In brief, this started as an interstate program for advance scheduling of job itineraries for migrant families and crews. In 1961, California offices intensified efforts to interest both interstate and intrastate migrant workers and their California employers in the mechanics and advantages of the Annual Worker Plan. As a result, the number of migrant groups contacted under the AWP increased from 112 interstate groups in 1960, to 395 in 1961, while the number of intrastate groups rose from 55 to 414. The total of 809 groups represented about 6,000 persons, of whom roughly 4,800 were workers. (A table showing the composition of the migrant groups accompanies this presentation.)

The AWP is designed primarily for those migrants who wish to establish a work pattern and follow approximately the same pattern from year to year, preferably working for the same employers, providing seasons and labor needs stay roughly the same. Many migrant groups move as "free-wheelers", finding their jobs through employment offices or on their own as they go. The Department of Employment would like to let more of such groups know about the AWP and the advantages it offers for knowing ahead of time--even before leaving home--that specific jobs are waiting in the work areas where commitments have been scheduled. The plan saves many groups waste travel and disappointment in their search for work, and it tends to reduce the number of moves and shorten the gaps of unemployment.

It is almost premature to mention another NEW program of the Department of Employment. Actually, this is a limited-term project--the Fresno Project, and it is just now in the initial stages of being set up to explore agricultural employment problems, and ways and means of improving farm employment service to workers--migrant and resident. Fresno County was selected as the site of the project because of the diversified nature of the farm work force and the agricultural industry served. Fresno is the nation's Number One agricultural county and its problems tend to be like those which occur to some degree in other counties of California, as well as in other states. The Bureau of Employment Security has made a special grant of funds for the project which is to be more than a study. It is to be a testing ground for experimental farm placement operations and techniques, tried out in actual service to the workers and farmers. This is really a glimpse into the future, and we have reason to hope and believe that it may provide a great deal of useful knowledge and experience. We expect it to guide California and other states toward more fruitful and more effective service to farm workers and farm employers--our goal in public service. Thank you.

ANNUAL WORKER PLAN CONTACTS WITH MIGRANT GROUPS OF FARM WORKERS BY OFFICES OF THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT - 1961

Composition of AWP Migrant Groups Contacted - Interstate and Intrastate

Annual Worker Plan (AWP) refers to employment service program designed to provide advance scheduling of job itineraries for agricultural migrant groups.

ITEM	All AWP Groups	INTRA-STATE CALIF*	INTERSTATE		
			Total	Home State Calif#	Home State Other#
Groups contacted re Annual Worker Plan	809	414	395	187	208
Crews--of unattached persons only..	124	80	44	22	22
Of families only.....	89	37	52	24	28
Of families & unattached....	28	10	18	7	11
One-family groups.....	426	221	205	96	109
Other (Singles not in crews).....	142	66	76	38	38
Persons in AWP groups contacted.....	6,004	2,820	3,184	1,246	1,938
Male, 16 and over.....	3,489	1,733	1,756	718	1,038
Female, 16 and over.....	1,124	471	653	260	393
Under 16.....	1,391	616	775	268	507
Workers in AWP groups contacted.....	4,790	2,303	2,487	1,038	1,449
Male, 16 and over.....	3,467	1,728	1,739	714	1,025
Female, 16 and over.....	992	410	582	245	337
Under 16.....	331	165	166	79	87
Families in AWP groups contacted.....	794	341	453	204	249
In crews of families only.....	244	90	154	67	87
In crews of families & unattached..	124	30	94	41	53
In one-family groups.....	426	221	205	96	109
Persons in all families.....	3,905	1,634	2,271	850	1,421
Male, 16 and over.....	1,413	562	851	329	522
Female, 16 and over.....	1,101	456	645	253	392
Under 16.....	1,391	616	775	268	507
Average persons per family...	4.9	4.8	5.0	4.1	5.7
Workers in all families.....	2,691	1,117	1,574	642	932
Male, 16 and over.....	1,391	557	834	325	509
Female, 16 and over.....	969	395	574	238	336
Under 16.....	331	165	166	79	87
Average workers per family...	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.1	3.7
Unattached adult male workers.....	2,076	1,171	905	389	516
Unattached adult female workers.....	23	15	8	7	1

NOTE: This table is limited to groups contacted by California re Annual Worker Plan.

*Intrastate California residents migrating within California only.

#Interstate - California residents working outside California part of year.
Other state residents working in California part of year.

CALIFORNIA'S DISABILITY INSURANCE PROGRAM FOR FARM WORKERS

By
Arthur W. Sawyer, Area Administrative Officer
Division of Disability and Hospital Benefits
California Department of Employment

California is one of four states with a disability insurance program to help protect the labor force against wage loss because of unemployment resulting from nonoccupational illness or injury. California is the only state to pay hospital benefits, in addition to those for wage loss, to claimants hospitalized for nonoccupational illness or injury.

When the California Unemployment Insurance Act was first adopted, it called for a contribution of 1% of taxable wages from employees as well as the employer contributions. Beginning in 1946, however, the Legislature provided a system of disability insurance designed to compensate for wage losses sustained by individuals unemployed because of nonindustrial sickness or injury to be financed by these employee contributions.

Employees pay for disability insurance and its administration. The employer, including farm employers, withholds from wages paid to employees 1% of the first $4100 paid to each during the calendar year 1962. (For 1961 the maximum taxable wage for disability insurance was $3600; for 1963, it will be $4600; for 1964, $5100; and for 1965 and future years, $5600.) The coverage has until this year, been the same as for unemployment insurance, but financed exclusively by employee contributions, at the rate of 1% on taxable wages.

Beginning on October 1, 1961, coverage for disability insurance was extended to agricultural labor, which is still excluded from the unemployment insurance program. Farm workers, including migrant farm workers, who harvest the crops in California are now eligible for disability insurance benefits if they earn a minimum of $300 during the "base period". Disability insurance claims may be filed by farm workers on and after May 1, 1962. Agricultural workers who are residents of other states but who migrate to California and earn the minimum ($300) may file claims for disability benefits while they are in California or from any other state when they become disabled. See below for information concerning the filing of disability insurance claims when the disabled person is outside the State of California.

Beginning with claims filed on or after January 1, 1962 (on or after May 1, 1962 for agricultural workers) for periods of disability commencing on and after January 1, 1962, eligible claimants may qualify for disability insurance benefits ranging from $10 to $70 a week, and for hospital benefits of $12 a day for each day of hospitalization up to 20 days. Further provision has been made to increase the weekly benefit amount above $70 a week when the average weekly wage paid in employment increases sufficiently.

Any claimant eligible for disability benefits is also entitled, during his confinement in a hospital on orders of a physician, to hospital benefits at the rate of $12 a day for a period not to exceed 20 days in any one disability period, in addition to the basic benefits. The 7-day waiting period required to be completed before basic disability benefits are payable, ends on the day the claimant is hospitalized. "Day" as defined, is any 24-hour period or part thereof for which a patient is charged a day's rate, and hospital benefits may, with the employee's consent, be paid directly to the hospital. The maximum total benefits a worker may draw for any period of disability are determined by his total wages from

employers earned during his "disability base period". Maximum benefits payable for a single period of disability are set at 26 times the weekly benefit amount.

To file a claim for disability insurance, the employee must obtain a claim form. This form may be obtained from any Department of Employment office and can be done by telephone or letter. Claims may also be obtained from doctors or hospitals. The claimant must completely fill out the "claim statement of employee" and give the form to the doctor for completion of the "doctor's certificate". A "doctor" may be any licensed physician and surgeon, osteopath, chiropractor, podiatrist, optometrist, dentist, or medical officer of a United States medical facility. Accredited religious practitioners may certify for basic benefits if any individual in good faith adheres to the teachings of any bona fide church, sect, denomination, or organization, and in accordance with its principles depends for healing entirely upon prayer and spiritual means.

Claimants may file for disability benefits while in another state or while anywhere outside the United States. To obtain a claim form for out-of-state claims, write to: Department of Employment, Disability Division, P.O. Box 711, Sacramento, California.

To be eligible for disability insurance a claimant in covered employment must:

1. Be ill or injured from causes not connected with his work.

2. Have earned at least $300 during a previous one-year pay period.

3. File his claim not later than the 20th day after the first day for which benefits are payable. (Late filing results in loss of payment for the number of days the claim is late.)

4. Serve a 7-day waiting period. Waiting period is not required from date of confinement to a hospital.

No disability insurance benefits are payable:

1. For a disability arising out of or caused by pregnancy during the course of the pregnancy or 35 days after termination of pregnancy, or 28 days after termination of pregnancy if the claimant is then hospitalized.

2. For any day during which the claimant is entitled to cash benefits for temporary disability indemnity under any workmen's compensation or employer liability law, except that if such benefits are less than the daily benefit amount the difference may be paid.

3. For any period during which the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance.

4. For disabilities which began during a trade dispute, unless the disability (a) was caused by an accident, or required hospitalization, and (b) was not caused by the trade dispute, and did not arise out of the trade dispute, and (c) would have occurred if there had been no trade dispute.

5. For any period of confinement of court order or certification in a public or private institution as a dipsomaniac, drug addict or sexual psychopath; or whenever legal custody is the cause of the unemployment.

6. On wages paid while the claimant had a "religious exemption certificate" on file; or if the claimant was self-employed, or otherwise no longer in the labor market, or if the claimant was covered by a voluntary plan of disability insurance.

The California Unemployment Insurance Code provides that an employer may adopt a "voluntary plan" instead of the "State plan" if a majority of his employees consent to the coverage. The "voluntary plan" may be self-insured, or insured by an insurance company. Because consent of the employees is necessary, such private plans are called "voluntary plans". If the claimant were covered by a voluntary plan on his last job and he left work because of a disability, he should obtain a voluntary plan claim form from his employer. Workers covered by a voluntary plan are furnished a description of the voluntary plan, called a "statement of coverage".

NEW FARM LABOR HEALTH SERVICE

By
Bruce Jessup, M.D., Rural Health Consultant
California Department of Public Health

At the San Jose Conference, eighteen months ago, a report was released on the health conditions and services for the seasonal workers. The study and report had been prepared by the State Health Department at the specific request of Governor Brown who asked that recommendations for appropriate State action be submitted. Consultations were obtained from growers, private practitioners, public health personnel, county supervisors, hospital staff members, nurses, educators and other concerned Californians. Some two hundred workers' families were visited in their labor camp and fringe area dwellings in Sutter, Fresno, and Imperial Counties.

All consulted agreed that the existing health conditions and limitations of health services were demonstrably shocking. All agreed that the provision of health services is primarily a family and local responsibility. It was again emphasized that in certain rural communities the seasonal labor influx seriously overtaxed the limited available medical services. All agreed that in addition to the primary local responsibility, there was obviously in relation to seasonal farm labor families health problems, a secondary State responsibility to assist those communities that needed and applied for State aid.

The report strongly recommended:

1. That the State make funds available to those agricultural counties desiring to decentralize and extend local health services for seasonal farm labor families.

2. That residence requirements for health services be abolished for this group.

3. That study be made of the feasibility of prepayment health plans for domestic families similar to the plans required by law for foreign contract workers.

What happened to these recommendations which were adopted at your last conference? Early in the 1961 session of the State Legislature, at the Governor's request, Senator O'Sullivan, introduced SB-282 which provided for financial and technical assistance from the State to assist applying counties desirous of extending their own health services. The bill further charged the State Health Department with responsibility for continued study of farm workers' health, and for technical assistance and coordination of the many health programs. $75,000 of the $108,000 appropriation in the Health Department budget was earmarked for allocation to local communities. The bill carried the endorsement of the California Farm Bureau Federation, Grange, Medical and Dental Associations, California Congress of Parents and Teachers, as well as churches and other groups. The measure was passed, signed by the Governor in mid-May, and funds were made available for disbursement to applying communities on July 1, 1961.

What specific steps have been taken?

1. Following your 1960 San Jose Conference, and the report on health conditions to Governor Brown, the California Farm Bureau organized some 25 meetings in 17 agricultural counties to examine health needs of farm workers at the local level and to provide leadership in coordination and extension of health services.

2. Dr. Merrill, Director, State Health Department, organized a State Advisory Committee on Farm Workers' Health. This was done one year ago in anticipation of the passage of the State legislation, SB-282. Representatives of the farm workers, Farm Bureau, Grange, California Medical Association, Dental Associations, State PTA, and departments of State Government accepted appointments to the Advisory Committee and have contributed immeasurably to the development of the program.

3. The State Health Department staff has worked to stimulate interest in extension of health services for farm workers throughout the State, and to provide technical assistance to concerned groups. The health educators assisted the Farm Bureau and the California Medical Association in developing and distributing 10,000 Family Health Records adapted in particular for use by migrating Spanish-speaking families. Brochures listing time and place of available medical resources were developed in six counties and widely distributed, as was a Spanish-English health education brochure for the workers. Of particular interest was a training program in health education designed by the Health Department staff and a Stanford sociologist, for the some 50 volunteer college students from the Migrant Ministry of the National Council of Churches. This group, which was effectively a "California Peace Corps," worked in eight farm labor camps during the summer harvest. Last year they gave new and special emphasis to health education.

4. Allan Grant, First Vice-President of the State Farm Bureau Federation, has told us of the progress being made in the development of a practical prepayment health plan for seasonal farm workers' families by the Farm Bureau, California Medical Association, and California Physicians' Service. There is currently great hope that a three-way plan for out-patient services can be developed for trial in one California county this summer. If negotiations are successful, such a plan could represent an important breakthrough, both in medical care plans for indigents, and in community recognition of farm workers' needs.

5. When State funds became available last July 1, applications for assistance in financing local communities plans to extend local health services for farm families were reviewed by the Advisory Committee. Funds were allocated to twelve of the most important agricultural counties in California. The grants varied in amount from $4000 to $15,000. The programs varied with the particular health needs of the local communities. Butte, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Yolo, Merced, Santa Cruz, Monterey, Tulare, Fresno, and Kern Counties all received SB-282 funds. In addition, groups in San Benito, Santa Clara and Contra Costa Counties extended their health programs with local community funds. Several teams of participants in local programs have at this conference presented to the Health Section, descriptions of their efforts. They are representative of fifteen counties that extended their health services last summer.

Dr. Raitt, the Health Officer of Colusa County, used State funds to obtain the services of an additional nurse and a college student to interview workers, physicians, and growers, and to visit the camps to ascertain health needs. On the basis of their survey findings, the Colusa Health Department staff took immunizations to the camps and prune orchards in a mobile station wagon clinic, and developed a liaison between farm workers and existing community health services. Dr. Raitt's report stated, "Prior to 1961, we provided no public health services to seasonal agricultural workers in Colusa County. In July, we

began extending our services to this group with two additional employees for the two-month harvest season. Our regular staff, three nurses and one sanitarian devoted approximately 50 percent of their time for these two months to this project."

Contra Costa County's group has told us how they provided the full-time services during their short apricot season, of one public health nurse and one sanitarian to visit camps, and talk with growers before the arrival of the seasonal workers. A careful survey with maps of the available camps was prepared. During the picking season they advised the families of where health services could be obtained, where lodging was available, and provided health education and counseling.

Dr. Frank Brewer and his team have described their Tuesday night clinic held in the Dos Palos Firehouse for the farm workers of that county area forty miles away from the Merced County Hospital. Staffed by dedicated local private physicians, volunteers from the community, and health department nurses, the clinic is furnishing medical care which is not now readily available to the farm labor group, raising the immunization level of the group, screening the group for hospitalization and/or other medical needs. They have concentrated on prenatal and postnatal care. Merced County Health Department nurses do follow-up and home visits. The services are closely coordinated with the county hospital.
Dr. Brewer illustrated his conviction that the clinic has been successful, and is accepted by the people with this story: "Each night the clinic is held, a young Mexican boy comes without being asked, to help the nurse carry in supplies. He waits until the clinic is over and helps reload the car. During the clinic, he opens the door for the patients and makes himself generally useful. Several members of his family have received help from this clinic, and he is giving something in return." The Merced team, impressed with the work of the Dos Palos Clinic, hope to start another such service at Planada this coming harvest season.

Lastly, Mr. Glenn Hildebrand, Mr. Tsun Hai Lee, health educators, and their group from Kern County told us of their program which has already been commended by the U.S. Public Health Service, California Medical Association, Community Service Organization, and other groups throughout the country. Kern County Health Department, impressed with the importance of cultural blocks in health work, recruited and trained a team of seasonal farm workers to function as "Community health aides." The aides were employed by the Health Department. The program has had wide community support. Kern County's group concluded from eight months' experience: "There are few better ways to rapidly reach across cultural, social and language barriers.....It is possible that the long-range effects of training these persons in basic health concepts and letting them actually work to help solve their own problems approaches optimal goals of health education methods... The aides have given great assistance to health education programs and to public health nursing activities. Both formal and informal evaluations support this." Kern County is planning to expand the community health aide program to other areas of the county this summer.

Are the health needs of farm workers being met in California? The answer must be a flat no. Despite the improvements over recent years in rural health, despite greatly expanded health knowledge, despite the tiny, but we believe important beginning efforts last summer, the gaps between what we know how to do and are doing remain indefensible. Too often we overlook the special difficulties in meeting health needs of seasonal farm families as a particular group. These difficulties stem from their economic, language, educational, housing, and cultural characteristics as well as in many cases from their mobility.

What plans for action in the health field are there for 1962? From present information it appears the same State Health Department fund of $75,000 under SB-282,

will be available to local communities to extend their services. County plans are currently being developed. We hope to extend our health education efforts and to obtain more advice and consultation from the farm workers themselves. We hope to coordinate California activities with those of health agencies in other western states, particularly through the efforts of Mr. Robert Bull and his work in migrant health through the Western Branch of the American Public Health Association. There is hope that the prepayment trial can be undertaken in one California county. Adequate extension will largely depend on the passage of the United States Public Health Department "migrant health" bill S.1130, which would make available additional funds.

In summary then, we can report that since the last conference at which action was recommended, steps, small but encouraging and in the right direction, have been taken in the field of health. The action has been at the local level to meet locally determined needs. The State Health Department effort has been as Dr. Merrill has said, "to strengthen private and public local health services for farm workers." All groups have shown a really inspiring willingness to do their part. As Allan Grant has emphasized, the health problems of California farm labor are a community responsibility, not just a grower responsibility.

NEW MINIMUM WAGE AND WORKING CONDITION REGULATIONS AS THEY APPLY TO WOMEN AND MINORS EMPLOYED IN FARM WORK

By
Beatrice L. Christensen, Special Representative
Division of Industrial Welfare, Department of Industrial Relations

1. WHAT FARM WORKERS ARE COVERED? Industrial Welfare Commission Order 14-61 applies to women and minors employed in all agricultural occupations.

2. WHAT AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATIONS ARE COVERED BY THIS ORDER? Generally, any occupation connected with the growing, cultivating and harvesting of agricultural products. All covered occupations are listed in detail in Section 2(c) of the order which may be obtained from the Division of Industrial Welfare office nearest you. Grading, sorting, packing and other operations performed after the product has been harvested are not covered by this regulation but are subject to Industrial Welfare Commission Order 13-61.

3. WHO IS A MINOR? For purposes of these regulations a minor is a boy or girl 12 through 17 years of age. Except for the children of the farmer, no child under the age of 12 may be employed. Minors 12 and 13 years of age may work only when school is not in session. Minors 14 through 17 years of age may work when school is not in session and after school. If the farmer is subject to federal regulations, minors under 16 may not be employed during school hours. Sixteen is the minimum age for employment in a dangerous occupation, such as the operation of moving machinery, working around moving belts, or handling dangerous insecticides labeled "poison."

   NOTE: The laws governing minimum age, permits, school attendance and dangerous occupations for minors employed in agriculture may be found in the Education Code and Labor Code.

4. WHO MUST COMPLY WITH THESE REGULATIONS? The employer of the women and minors is responsible for compliance. If a bona fide farm labor contractor provides the crew under contract to the farmer, the labor contractor is the employer. The head of a family who "contracts" with the owner of the farm to perform certain labor with his family is not the employer. In this case, the farmer is the employer and responsible for complying with these regulations.

5. WHEN DO THE WAGE PROVISIONS APPLY? If the farmer hires 10 or more women or minors 16 and 17 years of age, the wage provisions of this order apply.

6. WHO MUST BE PAID $1.00 PER HOUR? Each woman or minor 16 or 17 years of age who is employed on an hourly basis must receive not less than $1.00 per hour for all time worked.

7. WHO MUST BE PAID $4.00 PER DAY FOR REPORTING TIME PAY? Each woman or minor 16 or 17 years of age who has been hired on a piecework basis must receive not less than $4.00 for each day he or she is required to report and does report in the pay period. If the piecework earnings in the pay period are equal to or greater than $4.00 for each day the worker is required to report and does report, this provision is satisfied.

8. WHAT DOES "REQUIRED TO REPORT AND DOES REPORT" MEAN? "Required to report" means that a woman or minor 16 through 17 years of age is no longer an

applicant for a job but has actually been hired to perform work on a piecework basis. "And does report" means that the woman or minor who has been hired appears on the job at the specified time and place presumably ready, willing and able to work. Workers who apply at the gate because of help-wanted posters or other advertisements remain as applicants. They are not required to report for work until after they have been hired by the farmer or his agent.

If the employee's services are not needed on a succeeding day or if there is threat of rain or other weather conditions which would interfere with the day's work, the farmer should make a conscientious effort to tell the workers in advance of reporting for work that they are not needed.

If the employee is not able or willing to work or is terminated for just cause, the $4.00 need not be paid. (NOTE: Application of this provision is based on the facts of each case with consideration given to the intent of the parties and whether good faith has been shown by the employer, the employee, or both.)

9. WHAT RECORDS MUST BE KEPT FOR WOMEN AND MINOR EMPLOYEES? Payroll and time records must be kept which show the worker's name, address, age if under 18, total hours worked daily and the total wages paid in the payroll period.

10. WHO MUST HAVE A TIME RECORD? For purposes of these regulations, records must be kept for each minor employee 12 years or older and each woman worker.

11. WHAT IS THE PAYROLL PERIOD? The payroll period is the period of time covered by each payment to the employee. This period cannot be longer than one-half month, except for the employees who are provided room and board and who may be paid once a month. This is a requirement of Labor Code Sections 204 and 205.

If the head of a family is paid all the money for the family, the employer's records must show the amount of wages credited to each woman and minor member of the family who is employed.

12. WHO KEEPS THE TIME RECORDS? The employer is responsible to see that the time records are kept. However, he may secure the necessary information on hours worked from any source he wants. He may observe the work himself and record the time. He may have a foreman record the time and report it to him. He may have the head of the family report the hours worked and amount earned by each member of the family.

13. WHEN DOES THE FARMER HAVE TO PROVIDE TOILET FACILITIES? If six or more women or minors 12 years of age through 17 years are employed for more than two hours in one field location.

14. WHAT TOILET FACILITIES ARE ACCEPTABLE? Privies, chemical or portable units are acceptable if they are serviced and cleaned regularly; screened and ventilated; have toilet paper, toilet seats and lids; the pits are covered at regular intervals; and the facilities are reasonably convenient to the work areas.

15. WHERE SHOULD WASHING FACILITIES BE LOCATED? Adjacent to toilet facilities.

16. WHAT FACILITIES FOR DRINKING WATER ARE ACCEPTABLE? A drinking fountain or tank supply with individual cups or the employee's own cup are acceptable if the water is drinkable and reasonably convenient.

17. WHAT ARE THE WEIGHT-LIFTING RESTRICTIONS FOR WOMEN? A woman may not lift more than 35 pounds except on permit to the employer from the Division of Industrial Welfare. Under certain conditions permits may be granted up to the statutory maximum of 50 pounds. If the woman is working from a ladder and has to climb higher than five feet off the ground, the maximum weight she can lift or carry is 10 pounds. However, nothing would prevent the woman from climbing higher than five feet if by the time she has picked 10 pounds of fruit she has come down the ladder to a point where her feet are at the five foot level.

NOTE: Order 14-61 has included the statutory weight-lifting restrictions of 50 pounds and 10 pounds which have been in effect since 1929.

18. HOW IS APPLICATION MADE FOR A WEIGHT-LIFTING PERMIT? Forms may be obtained from the Division office nearest you and returned completed to that office. The agent in charge will be glad to ssist you.

If you have any question on the application of these regulations or would like copies of Industrial Welfare Commission Order 14-61, contact the Division of Industrial Welfare office nearest you.

REPORTS OF SIX STUDY GROUPS

GROUP 1 - EDUCATION

Chairman: Mrs. James C. Goble, Educ. Coordinator, Santa Clara Co. Migrant Ministry
Local Host: J. Post Williams, Tulare Co. Supt. of Schools, Visalia
Coordinator: John Sparks, Supvr., Child Welfare & Attendance, Tulare Co. Schools
Speaker: Mrs. Afton Dill Nance, Consultant in Elementary Educ., Calif. Dept. of Education. "Education for all the Children: A Practical Program at Kettleman City".

Education Discussion Group A: Problems of Attendance and Drop-Out

Leader: Mrs. Adrian Bellinger, Elem. Educ. Chairman, California Congress of Parents and Teachers

Consultants: Donald D. Quinn, Prin., DeWolf H.S., Fresno City Unified School Dist.; Mrs. Aileen Pierson, Dist. Rep., State Dept of Social Welfare; Earl T. Baker, Wage, Hour and Public Contracts Div., U.S. Dept. of Labor; Armistre Ametjian, Gen. Supvr., Tulare Co. Schools; Mrs. Rose Ellen Young, Supvr. of Child Welfare and Attendance, Kings Co. Schools; Harry Gower, Consultant, Child Welfare and Attendance, Fresno Co. Schools.

Findings: Legal remedies are now available to solve some problems of the education of the migrant minor and the drop-out. There is need for more cooperation between all who are involved in the development of the present program in the State.

Suggested Improvements: (1) Emphasis should be placed in teacher training courses on the cultural patterns of minority groups and migrant farm workers. (2) To prevent drop-outs, the educational program should be tailored to meet the needs of all children, to encourage potential drop-outs to stay in school. (3) Special educational programs for migrant youth should be held in schools located in farm communities rather than only in urban areas. (4) Continuation schools were advocated as being more attractive to the potential drop-out than regular school. (5) Problems of bilingualism should be given special attention. Schools should provide adequate interpreters to assure clear communication between teachers, students and parents. (6) Special tutoring and remedial reading programs should be available to drop-outs. (7) Community study halls and tutoring services should be made available for those students who do not find suitable study conditions at home.

Special Recommendation: This group endorsed the principles contained in Senate Bill 1124, Education for Migrant Children and Adults.

Education Discussion Group B: Problems of Adult Education and Retraining

Leader: Mrs. Frank Duveneck, American Friends Service Committee, San Jose.

Consultants: Lawrence E. Koehler, Consultant in Adult Educ., Calif. Dept. of Education; Dr. Patricia Hertert, Consultant in Adult Educ., Modesto; O. W. Fahrney, Exec. Dir., Tulare Co. Farmers' Assn; Ray Williams, Asst. Chief, Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation, Calif. Dept. of Educ.; G. A. Hutchings, Regional Supvr., Agricultural Educ., Calif. Dept. of Educ.; Anna Price Garner, Area Home Advisor, Agricultural Extension Service; Juan R. Govea, Local 3005, T.W.U., AFL-CIO; L. E. Koehler, Bureau of Adult Educ., Calif. Dept. of Educ.

Recorder: Mrs. Fred Roullard, Jr., Motion Picture, Radio and TV Chairman, 21st District, California Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Areas of Consideration: (A) Educational and retraining needs of seasonal farm workers and how they may be met effectively. (B) Pilot projects in adult education and retraining of seasonal farm workers in California. These included the pilot crew study program directed by the Tulare County Farmers Association in cooperation with the Giannini Foundation, the educational work with farm women directed by the California Extension Service Area Home Advisor in Kings and Tulare Counties in cooperation with the Departments of Health and Welfare, and the Literacy and Homemaking classes sponsored by the Migrant Ministry and American Friends Service Committee in Santa Clara County.

Findings: (1) Problems of seasonal unemployment are aggravated by limited range of farm workers' skills. (2) Need for adult retraining of farm workers as mechanization of agriculture increases obsolescence of former skills. (3) Need to strengthen communications between personnel offering educational and retraining services and farm workers. At present workers frequently don't know about classes that are available to them. Many Spanish-speaking workers do not read or write English. (4) Need for support from local organizations to survey educational and retraining felt-needs and also to interpret the resources available. (5) Need for training to be offered in locations within reach of farm workers. (6) Need for more cooperation between all organizations and agencies concerned with the welfare of seasonal farm workers and the workers themselves in planning any educational and retraining programs. (7) Although a fundamental need, education is not the cure-all for the many problems facing seasonal farm workers. (8) Agricultural workers as a general rule are willing and desirous of bettering themselves.

Suggestions for Improvement: (1) Retraining for skills in a variety of seasonal tasks could be a positive step toward full employment for a large segment of the agricultural work force. (2) Retraining programs should be planned with knowledge of farm jobs which will become obsolete within the next few years. Results of surveys on effects of automation on agriculture will be helpful in future adult education and retraining planning throughout the State. (3) Suggestions for improving communications between farm workers and organizations offering classes or training included: use of leaders from grass-root organizations to serve as liaison information and language interpreters; and use of Spanish to insure contact with farm workers who do not understand English. (4) Plans for educational and skills training must meet felt-needs of farm workers. Members of CSO and AWOC or farm workers groups should be included in attempts to explore these needs and the acceptable manner in which services can be offered. (5) Due to adults' long workdays, lack of child-care facilities, and transportation costs, it may be necessary to take classes and training to farm labor camp sites or fringe areas where workers live. (6) Close cooperation between farm workers, welfare, health, education and agricultural extension departments as well as various church and voluntary organizations is necessary to insure a well-rounded program of services to seasonal farm workers. (7) Request for assistance from the Peace Corps was suggested as a possible aid in strengthening efforts of communities attempting to provide suitable services for seasonal farm workers. (8) A central clearing house for information should be established to collect and disseminate information as to methods being used by both private and public agencies to train and retrain adults working in agriculture. It was suggested that this responsibility could be handled effectively by a Governor's Advisory Committee.

Reference Materials Available to Group: (1) "Vocational Rehabilitation of Itinerant Farm Workers" from Migratory Labor Notes - President's Committee on Migratory Labor, Washington, D.C., No. 13, Nov., 1960. pp 7-8. (2) "Education of the Adult Migrant" by E. W. Brice - OE-13012, Bulletin, 1961 - No. 6., Adult Educ. Section, Office of Educ., Washington, D.C. (3) "New Dimensions in Living" - informational letter prepared by Tulare Co. Agricultural Extension Service. January, 1962. Sample includes low-cost food chart for adequate diets.

Education Discussion Group C: Summer Schools for Children of Seasonal Farm Workers

Leader: Wilmer M. Forstedt, Prin., Huron Elem. School, Coalinga-Huron School Dist.

Recorders: Mrs. T. C. Binkley, 6th Dist., Calif. Cong. of P. & T.; Mrs. Dorothy P. Drumm, 21st Dist., Calif. Cong. of P. & T.; Mrs. Albert Pearson, 21st Dist., Calif. Cong. of P. & T.

Consultants: Roy Carson, Prin., Pine Crest Elem. School, Sebastopol Union Schools; Mrs. J. C. Goble, Coordinator, Educ. for Seasonal Farm Families, Santa Clara Co. Council of Churches; Mrs. Harriet Jowett, Coordinator, Educ., Fresno Co. Schools; Marlene Tanioka, Teacher, Calif. Migrant Ministry, Merced.

A. Analysis of Programs: Summer schools for migrant children have been of two types: those offered by elementary school districts in regular school buildings supported by State and local school funds as in Coalinga-Huron and Sebastopol, and those held at camp sites by representatives of the Migrant Ministry and the American Friends Service Committee supported by volunteer workers and private funds as in Gridley and Santa Clara County. They have met common problems as follows:

1. Ineffective communication between school personnel and the parents of migrant children is a major problem. Migrant families may not know that summer schools exist or that they are permitted to enroll their children in them. School administrators may not know how many migrant children may be in the area, when they will arrive, or for how long a time they will stay.

2. In many areas regular summer school enrollment is closed before migrant families arrive. In these areas enrollment of migrant children is not possible unless summer school administrators reserve space for them or adjust the timing of the school.

3. Transportation is not available. Many school districts do not offer bus facilities for summer school pupils. Parents of migrant children go to the fields hours before summer school classes begin in the morning.

4. Attendance requirements frequently rule out migrant children. Some districts require parents to sign statements that their children will be in near-perfect attendance in summer school so they will be assured of the necessary ADA to finance the program. Migrant parents cannot honestly make such promises.

5. Lack of acceptable clothing keeps many children from summer school. Proud migrant parents will not consider sending their children to school without acceptable clothing. Many do not budget for shoes during the summer months.

6. No supervision for the children is available before and after school. When both parents go to the fields early, frequently there is no one to dress the children for school, prepare sack lunches when needed, and get them to the school bus or to school on time. Problems of getting these children to school and back home to camp sites after a half-day session is one of the reasons that some migrant parents hesitate to enroll their children.

7. The need for migrant children to work prevents some from attending summer school. Many migrant children are needed in the fields to help earn the family income. They may pick into the hampers and boxes of their parents or older sisters and brothers before they are old enough to qualify for work permits. Other children are needed to care for babies and preschool children so their mothers can work in the crops.

8. Social and cultural differences continue to present problems. In California a majority of seasonal farm workers are Mexican-American. Language barriers, lack of residence status, real or imaginary discrimination and nonacceptance, failure to realize the importance of education for future job preparation, and substandard living conditions add to the educational problems which confront school people as they work to educate all of the children.

9. Inadequate financing for summer schools for migrant children is a major problem. Districts with low or modest tax bases face problems of providing adequate buildings, teachers, and instructional materials for regular full-day sessions and are pressed to extend educational offerings. Supplemental financing must be found if districts plan special migrant summer schools similar to the pilot project conducted in Sebastopol last summer. (This program was partially financed by the Rosenberg Foundation.)

B. Suggested Solutions: Action which would strengthen the possibility of establishing summer schools in districts where a significant number of children from seasonal farm families reside during the summer are as follows:

1. Strengthen communication with migrant parents through: (a) Enlisting the help of members of voluntary agencies, especially those who are Spanish-speaking or are acquainted with Mexican-American sociocultural patterns to make personal contacts. (b) Utilizing special television and radio programs prepared in Spanish, and increasing the use of stations which broadcast regular programs in the Spanish language. (c) Increasing the utilization of Spanish language newspapers.

2. Schedule regular or special summer school sessions at a time when migrant children can attend. Harvest peaks are different throughout the State. Administrators anxious to include migrant children in summer schools can secure labor figures from their local Farm Labor Offices or the State Migrant Ministry.

3. Provide school buses to transport children to and from summer schools. Where this is not feasible, car pools may be established to transport them.

4. Utilize the help of community agencies. Getting migrant children into summer schools presents more problems than the schools can resolve without the assistance of other organizations. Cooperation should be encouraged between the school, health and welfare agencies, Parent Teachers Assn., farm management individuals and groups, Migrant Ministry, Community Service Organization, American Friends Service Committee and other concerned community organizations. These groups could assist with personal contact work to interpret the summer school program. They could also help in the provision of clothing and health services, transportation, lunches and child care after school hours.

5. Enforce the child labor laws. Adjustments must be made in the wage structure of seasonal farm families if children are to be freely released to pursue their education during summer months. This supplementary schooling is vital to offset loss of time due to travel, illness, family responsibilities, and other factors which prevent regular school attendance. The costs reflected in staggering welfare loads, increased juvenile delinquency, broken homes and

other evidences of lack of preparation for responsible adulthood, will far outweigh those incurred for preventive educational and training measures. Migrant children must be kept in school.

6. Current legislation now before Congress would assist California in providing summer schools for migrant children (S.1124). The group recommended an amendment to the National Defense Education Act (PL864) to include a provision for teaching English as a foreign language to children for whom English is not the native tongue.

C. Special Recommendations: (1) To support the Commission on Educational Policy of the California Teachers Association regarding the summer school program in California. (2) To support recommendations made in Emerging Summer School Practices, a report (1960) of the California Elementary School Administrators Association. (3) To urge additional State funds be made available to districts where numbers of migrant children reside during summer months in order to finance summer schools for children of migrant workers. (4) To request that the report from this discussion group be made available throughout the State to school districts that educate migrant children.

Education Discussion Group D: Teaching English as a Second Language to Elementary School Pupils

Leader: Mrs. Afton Dill Nance, Consultant in Elem. Educ., Calif. Dept. of Educ.

Recorders: Mrs. T. R. Schmidt, State Migrant Committee, Calif. Council of Churches; Mrs. Howard Turpenen, Calif. Cong. of P. & T.

Resource Persons: Mrs. Beatrice Arce, Consultant in Foreign Languages, Brawley Elem. Schools; Margarita Escobedo, Teacher of Spanish, Stockton City Schools; Mrs. Ruth Fifield, Consultant Elem. Educ., Imperial Co. Schools; Mrs. Gertrude Meadows, Librarian, Kettleman City Elem. School.

Following presentations by members of the resource group and general discussion these recommendations were made:

1. Special efforts should be made to help children who do not speak English as their mother tongue to feel that they are part of the school and all of its activities. An atmosphere should be created in the classroom and the school which helps these children to be willing and anxious to learn.

2. These girls and boys should be placed in classrooms with children of approximately their own age and size. Representatives of one school reported that regardless of academic grade placement no child was ever retarded more than two years. (California Journal of Elementary Education. November, 1958. pp 116-122.)

3. Parents should be helped to understand the purposes of the school and the importance of regular attendance. The child's own culture should be treated with respect at all times. Children should not be forbidden to speak their native language, but should be encouraged to speak English, and given systematic instruction so they can do so easily and effectively.

4. Learning a language follows a specific sequence: understanding, speaking, reading and writing. Reading and writing should be delayed for children who have an inadequate background in English, and experiences in understanding and in speaking should be greatly expanded.

Experiences in understanding include the building of concepts. Many children fail in reading because they have not had the experiences which give meaning to the written word. Short study trips planned to develop meaning for a selected group of words or ideas have been effective. For instance, children may visit a

new house which is being built, and learn such words as roof, carpenter, lumber, nails, concrete. These experiences are more effective when the children can go in groups of not more than five accompanied by a person who has been instructed in the concepts and vocabularly to be developed. Frequently the help of members of the community or of older children can be enlisted for this service.

Film strips, recordings, flat pictures and a wide variety of objects which can be handled and named, are also effective means of building concepts and vocabulary. The children must have many chances to talk freely so they can formulate and practice what they are learning. School terms such as drinking fountain, black top, lavatory, eraser, chalk, crayon can be readily taught by utilizing the immediate environment.

The building of concepts, is a gradual process and sufficient time must be given for the children to develop a store of understandings before reading is introduced.

5. Schools serving children for whom English is not the mother tongue should plan a sequence of language development which extends through the elementary and secondary schools. Many children appear to understand much better than they actually do and the effect of living in two languages extends into adult life. Foreign language experts recommend a twenty-minute period of instruction daily for eight or ten years in order to achieve reasonable facility in the target language. When English is the target language many schools have left instruction to chance and great wastage of human potential has resulted.

6. In-service education opportunities should be provided to help teachers attain the attitudes and skills necessary to teach English as a foreign language. A school philosophy should be developed which recognizes the seriousness of the problem. All personnel should understand the importance of understanding and speaking English before competence in reading and writing is expected.

7. Schools serving children who speak little or no English should explore the possibility of establishing summer schools for preschool children. (State funds to support such schools are not now available, although funds are available for Child Care Centers.)

8. Materials should be developed and experiments tried in many districts throughout California to improve the teaching of English to children for whom it is not the native tongue. One simple experiment would be to introduce 20 minutes of language development each day in classes enrolling Spanish-speaking children.

This instruction could be given to a small group within the room, or if a special teacher is available, the children might leave the room for the special help. In either case, groups should be kept small so that the children have many opportunities for individual practice. (The Army Language School in Monterey schedules adults in classes of not more than seven.)

Materials in Teaching Children Who Move with the Crops (Fresno County Schools 1955) and Teachers' Guide to the Education of Spanish-speaking Children (Calif. Dept. of Education, Sacramento, 1952) are available to all, and give a wealth of excellent suggestions.

Special recommendations from the group were to urge the passage of HR 8880 which provides federal funds for the education of migrant children and to recommend that the National Defense Education Act be amended to include teaching English as a foreign language.

GROUP 2 - HEALTH

Chairman: Mrs. Robley Berry, Legislative Chairman, California Congress of Parents and Teachers.
Local Host: Evelyn E. Martin, Director, Kings Co. Health Dept.
Coordinator: Margie Scriven, Tulare Co. Health Dept.
Recorders: Brian Dobrow, Health Educator, San Joaquin Local Health District; Robert Pull, Chief, Division of Migrant Health, Western Regional Office, American Public Health Association.

Case studies representing local programs carried out in four California counties were presented with emphasis on effectiveness, program gaps and future plans.

Community Case Study #1 - Contra Costa County

Consultants: Glen W. Kent, M.D., Chief Asst. Health Officer, Contra Costa Co. Health Dept.; Joseph S. Silva, Supvr., Contra Costa Co.; Mrs. Francis McKenzie, Public Health Nurse, Contra Costa Co. Health Dept.; Sam Sagara, Sanitarian, Contra Costa Co. Health Dept.

The first case study dealt with a county migrant health survey and nursing and sanitation project in Contra Costa County. This was focussed on camp visits by public health nurses and efforts to improve housing facilities for migrant families. The county had in 1960 experienced some relatively severe problems with families "camping out" along the side of canals and roads. Basic objectives of the 1961 migrant health program were to: (a) identify the migrants and their health problems; (b) improve sanitation and establish medical procedures for action based on the philosophy of helping the migrant family to help itself through better utilization of already available resources; (c) through decentralization of public health nursing services; (d) improve sanitation practices; (e) improve living facilities.

Program gaps, or unmet needs were: lack of support for the establishment of a county-sponsored camp, lack of complete information or communications between areas and agencies re: families and their problems, adequate transportation facilities and concerted assistance in solving health, nutrition and dental care problems.

Future plans include: (a) efforts to obtain community support and recognition of the need for adequate housing and support for the development of a county camp; (b) efforts aimed at improved communications with other agencies; (c) efforts geared toward gaining acceptance of services by the migrant families; and (d) continued decentralization of nursing services.

Community Case Study #2 - Kern County

Consultants: Glenn Hildebrand, Director, Health Educ. Div., Kern Co. Health Dept.; Clifford Nagel, Public Health Administrator, Kern Co. Health Dept.; Dorothy Potts, Supervising Public Health Nurse, Kern Co. Health Dept.; Carole Rugnao, Community Health Educ. Aide, Kern Co. Health Dept.; Russell Paulson, Pastor, Shepherd of the Valley Lutheran Church, Lamont; Tsun Hai Lee, Health Educator, Kern Co. Health Dept.

Kern County's presentation dealt with a health education program aimed at more effective utilization of existing services through the use of health education aides recruited from the agricultural worker population. These community health aides were selected to help break down the cultural barriers between the seasonal farm workers and the professional health workers. After training by the health

department, they helped establish a two-way flow of communication "to infuse the feeling of 'simpatico' rather than that of being led around by the hand." It was pointed out that we often get too professional and need to do something to make the problem more real, to personalize health services in order to inspire migrants and others to help themselves. Future plans call for extension of the program into additional areas in the county and continued utilization of health education aides in areas where they are already established. It was re-emphasized that the people themselves can assist in the health education work if helped along the way and given suitable training and basic information.

Community Case Study #3 - Colusa County

Consultants: Albert E. Raitt, M.D., Health Officer; Nancy Bertram, Director, Public Health Nursing, and Louis Sanders, Sanitarian, Colusa Co. Health Dept.; Genevieve Cloud, Social Worker, Colusa Co. Welfare Dept.

Colusa County's presentation dealt with their county-wide survey of migrant health and environmental sanitation problems and the development of a mobile immunization clinic. The basic objective of the program was to study health needs and provide needed immunizations for the migrant families in the area at the peak season. Polio and DPT shots were given to over 90% of the families. As a result of the program rapport was established with the families through nursing interviews. Discussions with the growers resulted in more constructive interest on their part. More motivation of growers is necessary, combined with greater emphasis on the education of the family on general health and sanitation. The bringing of the immunization services to the people where they worked in the fields or in the camps was notably successful.

Community Case Study #4 - Merced County

Consultants: A. Frank Brewer, M.D., Health Officer, and Margaret F. Smith, Public Health Nurse, Merced Co. Health Dept.; Dos Palos Night Clinic Staff including John Batson, M.D., Peggy Giles, Clerical Asst., and Jean Koda, Volunteer.

The South Dos Palos area was chosen for this project because the existing health program in the county has not met the health needs of the people. To obtain medical care, it was necessary to take time off from the jobs they needed so badly. Many of these workers will not, or cannot, take time off during the day for the trip to the County Hospital, approximately 40 miles away. When they are not working, they cannot afford to buy the gas or pay their friends to bring them to Merced. There is no direct bus service from the west side of the county to Merced.

Location: South Dos Palos is located in the southwest section of Merced County in an agriculturally poor section with a high water table and no adequate drainage. During the winter months the houses sit in lakes of water, and in the summer the ground is bare and dusty. The houses are for the most part one, two, or three-room shacks in a sad state of repair without water or bathroom facilities. A survey was made in 1961 by the Health Department, at the request of the Carver Christian Association of South Dos Palos with the assistance of 26 interested persons in the area.

The following information was obtained from the survey: 54.5% have a source of running water in the house from the old system or wells; 30% have flush toilets; 28.5% have bathing facilities; 47% have no running water; 97.5% haul their drinking water in cans; 53% have pit privies.

Recently a water district was formed in the community, but to date relatively few residents, especially in the fringe area, have the water piped into their homes and continue to haul all of their water in five-gallon milk cans. The water is purchased from established "Water Dealers" at fifty cents a can. Well water, in this area, is of a quality impossible to use for drinking purposes and very poor for bathing and utility use.

A sanitary sewer district is in the paper stage and when this is established, perhaps the majority of homes will have running water and flush toilets.

Occupation: The majority of the residents of South Dos Palos are farm laborers and are employed on a seasonal basis; earning $1.00 to $1.25 per hour. Cotton pickers are paid $3.00 per hundred pounds. The chopping of cotton and sugar beets is paid for by the row. During the summer months, a few of the people work in the rice mill and help with the shipping of sugar beets. Cantaloupe packing is done by skilled workers who return year after year and make excellent wages.

Local Aid: Dos Palos has a central committee whose purpose is to supply food and clothing to the needy, not eligible for welfare. The church societies also provide layettes and clothing for children. A local dairy supplies the clinic with 50 one-third pints of milk each Tuesday. Some of the milk is made into hot cocoa for those who wish it. No milk is ever left.

Welfare Department: The Merced County Department of Public Welfare has a branch office in Dos Palos. The social worker does not come to the clinic, but patients are referred to the office for food orders and hospital clinic cards.

Schools: The schools in the area have recognized the importance and the usefulness of the clinic. Students, from the local school, are often referred to the clinic with their parents. The administrators in the area, and the school nurses frequently drop in to offer their services, and to visit the clinic and staff.

Health Problems in the Community: Many women did not receive prenatal care until they were ready to deliver, and few returned for a postpartum examination. Immunization was a hit and miss affair. Some of the families had large outstanding bills with the local doctors which they could not hope to pay, however, they were ashamed to ask for more free care. The older age group did without care because it was hard for them to find transportation.

The Patients: It was not difficult to get patients to attend the clinic. It had been difficult and usually impossible to get patients to the Merced County General Hospital 40 miles away. If a patient attended the clinic, it meant that the father had to take a day off from the fields and lose one day's pay, the children were also taken because there was no place to leave them, and they waited the greater part of the day to see the doctor. When the clinic first started most of the patients were referred by the nurse, however, gradually this has changed and only a few come only on the nurse's referral. She sees them in the clinic and in the home, often giving nursing care as ordered by the physician in the clinic. She conducts the Child Health Conference with the same physicians who work in the clinic. If she finds anyone in the area with problems, she feels free to say, "Please come to the clinic Tuesday evening to discuss this with the doctor. He will be able to treat you." The patients watch for the county car to arrive at the firehouse, and they soon begin to drop in to discuss medical, welfare, or family problems. Many only wish to talk to someone about their problems, but others need a referral to another agency for help.

No one is refused care if they come to the clinic. However, all patients are interviewed to be sure they do not have a medical trust fund card. If they have a card, they are referred to a private physician in the area.

The majority of people who attend the clinic are colored, uneducated field laborers. They have lived in Merced County approximately 3 years although they often leave the county for a short time to work elsewhere.

Objectives: (1) To furnish medical care to the migratory labor group which is not now readily available. (2) To raise the immunization level of the group. (3) To furnish prenatal and postnatal care. (4) To furnish general medical care on an out-patient basis to this group. (5) To screen this group for hospitalization and/or other medical needs.

To meet these broad objectives, we planned to offer the following services: (1) To offer care to all patients on a family basis. (2) To offer medical examination and care for acute and chronic disease. (3) To offer obstetrical care AP and PP. (4) To offer infant and preschool examinations and care (if the children are not ill they are referred to the CHC in the area, if they can get there). (5) To give immunizations to all age groups. (6) Tuberculin testing to all age groups. (7) To do a phenylketonuria test to all babies 3 months of age and under. (8) To do home nursing if necessary. (9) To do group teaching of prenatals.

The Staf The permanent staff consists of four doctors, a registered nurse, a clerk, and two public health nurses. The four doctors from the community of Dos Palos staff the clinic on a rotating basis. They arrive at (7) seven each evening and remain until all the patients are seen. These men are to be commended for their interest in, concern for, and care of the patients. There is no implication of charity in the medical care they gave. The registered nurse, who assists the doctor, is also from Dos Palos and she is aware of the problems of these people. The clerk is from the South Dos Palos area, and is employed during the day in the post office. Her information is most valuable because she knows the condition and problems of many of the patients.

Shortly after the clinic began, a nurse was employed to work on the project. We were fortunate in finding a nurse who speaks Spanish fluently. She has been very helpful in helping with the few Spanish-speaking patients seen in the clinic.

Volunteers: The volunteers are from the area of South Dos Palos. They are housewives, teachers, and business women. During the summer the migrant missionaries helped in the clinic. Two medical students were assigned to Merced County for a summer survey and they were also very helpful to the staff.

It would be almost impossible to operate a clinic of this nature without the volunteers. Their service is most valuable and their loyalty unquestionable. Two volunteers have been taught to do all the weighing, to take TPR's, to do the phenylketonuria tests and to record the information on the charts. A volunteer also assists the clerk with the registration of patients which includes filling out the headings on the charts and immunization cards. When necessary, the volunteers will hold a baby or watch him while the mother is being examined by the doctor.

Supplies: The next problem, after the building was found, was to determine the least amount of equipment we would need to operate the clinic. The equipment in the firehouse consisted of long tables, folding chairs, and benches. It also contained a refrigerator which contained odds and ends of food. It was enough!

It was more than a public health nurse usually has to work with in many clinics, other than the supplies she takes with her. The two most important items were an examining table and a storage cabinet. We bought a large metal storage cabinet, with lock, which holds all the equipment we leave in the building. Equipment includes medicine, forms, instruments, pamphlets, linen, scales, etc. The examining table is an old model given to the clinic by two of the doctors.

Standard medicines are stocked, plus, those the individual doctor felt was absolutely necessary. This was a slight problem at first, because we were working with four different doctors with different ideas. If a prescription is necessary and the patient is financially unable to buy it, it is filled at the Merced County General Hospital and the patient may get it Friday during the follow-up clinic. If it is an emergency, the nurse in the area will deliver it the day following the clinic.

Operation of the Clinic: The clinic is held each Tuesday evening and the patients begin to arrive at 6:00 p.m. The garage is the center of activity as it is used as a waiting room, also registration, weighing, immunization, tuberculin testing, taking temperature, pulse and respiration. One corner is set aside for a children's play area under the watchful eyes of the volunteers. A table with books, crayons, color books and puzzles is provided. A toy box is filled with washable toys. Instead of a play pen, a rubber raft is inflated and placed on the floor for the smaller children to sit in while playing. At the immunization table a large plastic pumpkin is filled with wrapped candies. As each child receives his "shot" he is permitted to take a treat from the pumpkin. This little trick has done much to eliminate the screaming and crying in this small area.

The social room of the firehouse is used for group teaching of prenatals, as a conference room for the public health nurse and the isolation of patients with suspected communicable disease.

The kitchen has been converted into an examining room for the doctor. The equipment he uses is within easy reach. All the medications he orders, for the patients in the clinic, are checked by the doctor and given by the registered nurse.

The Physician's Role: The physician is in charge of the clinic although he does not see all the patients. He is always available to see any of the patients and to answer any questions the staff may have about a patient or procedure. The average number of patients the doctor sees each clinic session is approximately 25, but this varies with the season. During the last six months he has done 440 examinations. They have been divided as follows: Medical - 261, Prenatal - 125, Infant - 30, P.P. 24.

Medical patients are divided into acute and chronic, but this category covers a "multitude of sins." According to our policy the chronically ill patients may be examined three times by the physician and then if the doctor feels it is necessary he refers the patient to the Merced County General Hospital for further tests and treatments which are not available at the clinic.

The acutely ill patient is given drugs, and simple laboratory work may be ordered. If the drug is one which must be injected, the nurse receives orders to give the drug in the home. Patients whom the physician believes should be hospitalized are sent to the county hospital with a referral containing the doctor's findings and his recommendation for the admission to the hospital. Only one acutely ill infant has been hospitalized.

Pediatric cases seen by the doctor include upper respiratory infections, otitis media, diarrhea, orthopedic problems, and congenital anomalies. Upper respiratory infection is the most prevalent and is closely followed by diarrhea. Because of the number of diarrhea cases we have seen in the clinic, the boiling of water to be given to babies and preschoolers is stressed.

The prenatal patient is given a complete physical examination at the time of her first visit by the doctor. After his examination, he decides how often she should be seen in the clinic and encourages her to take advantage of the prenatal discussion period. She is examined by the doctor each time she returns to the clinic.

Prenatal Care: This group of patients probably receives the greatest benefit from the clinic. At first it was necessary to refer the patient into the clinic and to urge them time and time again to come in before they were in a month or two of delivery. After a few months they began coming to the clinic in the first trimester or the early part of the second. Some improvement has been made during the last six months as these figures prove: First visits: First Trimester - 12; Second Trimester - 18; Third Trimester - 18.

On the first visit to the clinic a complete obstetrical history is taken, a complete physical examination is done by the physician, and blood and urine are taken for laboratory examination, which included CBC, Hgb, Rh factor, STS and complete urinalysis. She is also given a tuberculin test and polio vaccination if it is needed. On each subsequent visit she is weighed, has her TPR checked, B/P checked, urine tested for albumin and sugar, and she is seen by the doctor.

All prenatals are asked to join the group teaching class. These classes start about 6:00 p.m. and usually last about one hour. When the patients arrive for class, they are served coffee, milk or hot chocolate before the class starts. This method of relaxing the tension which accompanies a new experience was suggested by the MCH consultant, Miss Lois Goodman, who visited the clinic one evening. The nurse has found this to be an excellent way to start the class.

Each week one topic pertaining to their pregnancy is introduced for discussion. The following subjects have been discussed by the nurse and the patients:

1. Anatomy and physiology of reproduction - this group knows little about their body and its functions, but they are very interested in learning.

2. Diet and nutrition - their diets are high in carbohydrates and fats, especially during the winter when they are unemployed. The diet varies with the seasons and depends upon the fruits and vegetables that are plentiful. This was a very interesting lesson and after they had learned the four basic food groups each woman analyzed her own diet and came up with a conclusion about its adequacy.

3. Signs of labor and admission to hospital - in this discussion the nurse explains why each procedure is done and what the terms mean. The women who have had children before can explain very well about the beginning of labor and when to leave for the hospital.

4. The importance of early prenatal care and the postpartum examination is stressed (some of the patients have never had a postpartum examination). These people know many old wives' tales that the nurse must dispel through a logical explanation.

Each prenatal patient receives a wallet-sized, green card which she is instructed to carry with her and to present to the hospital when she arrives for delivery. The card, in addition to her name and address, gives such information as parity,

EDC, results of STS, Rh factor, Hgb., skin test results, X-ray results, and other information which may be valuable to the physician. When the patient has reached her 7th month of pregnancy, the clinic record is summarized and placed in the emergency room of the Merced County General Hospital, so that it will be available when she arrives for delivery.

Postpartum and Infants: Infants are referred for a six weeks' checkup with the mother. Before the doctor's examination, each baby is weighed, has a PKU test and is given its second DPTP. Each baby receives a thorough examination and if it is all right is referred to the Child Health Conference. One congenital heart was found in this group and is now under care through CCS.

Immunizations: Immunizations are given to all persons coming to the clinic. That is, no age limit is placed on the immunizations. We find that many adults have not received tetanus or diphtheria, and have not had smallpox vaccination since they were infants. The fathers are a little reluctant to be immunized, but with a little pushing they step up for their shots with the children. Each person immunized receives a small-wallet sized card which he is instructed to keep in his wallet.

Statistics - July through December, 1961

(1) Number of patients examined by the doctor: Medical 261; Antepartum 125; Postpartum 24; Infants (6 weeks' check) 30.

(2) Number of people receiving immunizations: 626; Total immunizations 883; Total finishing series 178; Number receiving Boosters 179.

(3) Number of Tuberculin Tests 291; Negative 204; Positive 64; Did not return for reading 23.

(4) Number of tests for phenylketonuria (PPA) 30.

(5) Maternity - First Visits: 48.

(6) Referred to clinic by: PHN 62; Self 220.

(7) Number of referrals to PHN: 16.

(8) Total clinic visits which includes immunizations, tuberculin testing, etc. - 1,301.

Home Care: Sixteen patients were referred to the nurse for follow-up care. These visits included giving medications, applying dressings, observing the patient, and to demonstrate nursing procedure to the family. If these visits had not been made by the nurse, hospitalization of the patient would have been necessary. Only one baby was hospitalized because the physician felt the mother was not capable of caring for the child.

Other Patients: A few senior citizens (under 65) not eligible for any type of relief, come to the clinic. They suffer from various chronic diseases. These people often sit until the end of the clinic reading magazines, visiting with the other patients or watching the children in the play area.

How the Community Feels about the Clinic: This clinic is becoming a community center and social affair project. When the examining table was delivered by the county truck, Mr. Norman, the Chief Sanitarian who was present, asked some of the men standing around the grocery store to help them unload and move it into the

firehouse. Several volunteered immediately, but refused to be paid for their work saying, "You have brought us medical care, and we want to do anything we can to help you."

Each night the clinic is held, a young Mexican boy comes without being asked, to help the nurse carry in supplies. He waits until the clinic is over and helps reload the car. During the clinic he opens the door for the patients and makes himself generally useful. Several members of his family have received help from this clinic, and he is giving something in return.

Summary: The South Dos Palos Night Clinic has been an interesting experience for the Health Department personnel, and we are convinced that this type of clinic is at last meeting some of the needs of a group of people in the lower income bracket of our community. We are at last seeing an entire family and giving medical care to them. The father is the most reluctant member of the family to ask for, or accept medical care, unless he is very ill. The clinic has been successful and it has been accepted by the people. Much of the credit for its success must be given to the nurse who has given much of herself and spent much time planning and working in the clinic.

Unmet Needs

(1) Better housing, which includes water and sewers. (2) Recreation center and planned programs throughout the year. (3) Adult education courses. (4) Better clinic facilities.

Plans for Next Year

(1) Continue the night clinic in South Dos Palos, emphasizing importance of early prenatal care and the postpartum examinations and teaching infant and preschool care. (2) Classes during the summer for girls who are interested in volunteering for the night clinic, teaching simple nursing procedures and preparation and serving of simple nutritious foods. (3) Classes for prenatal patients. (4) Clinic in Planada during harvest season.

GROUP 3 - CHILD CARE

Chairman: Winslow Christian, Superior Court Judge, Sierra Co., Chairman, Calif. Welfare Study Commission
Local Host: Hilmi Fuad, Director, Tulare Co. Welfare Dept.
Coordinator: William Flynn, Child Welfare Supvr., Tulare Co. Welfare Dept., Visalia
Recorders: Mrs. Vlad Sullivan, Case Work Consultant, and Richard T. Van Metre, Jr., Public Assistance Specialist, Calif. Dept. of Social Welfare, Sacramento

Panelists: John W. Weber, Supervisor of Child Care Centers, Dept. of Social Welfare; Helen Clauson, Chief, Bureau of Boarding Homes and Institutions, Dept. of Social Welfare; Emma E. Gunterman, Gridley Child Care Center; John B. Castiglione, M.D., Pediatrician, Visalia; William D. Lynch, Prin., Crowley School, Visalia; Harold E. Simmons, Deputy Director, Program Development, Calif. Dept. of Social Welfare.

Consultants: Frances Presley, Consultant, Child Care Centers, Calif. Dept. of Educ.; Frances McFeely, Casework Consultant, Dept. of Social Welfare; Lela Mae Duke, farm worker, Strathmore; Maria Moreno, farm worker, Stockton; William Flynn, Child Welfare Supervisor, Tulare Co. Welfare Dept.; Mary McFarland, Field Supervisor, Calif. Migrant Ministry, San Jose; Phyllis Kellogg, agriculturist, Sutter Co. Farm Bureau; Mrs. Charles Fisher, agriculturist, Strathmore.

Program Planner: Ruth M. Wilson, Acting Chief, Bureau of Aid to Needy Children, Calif. Dept. of Social Welfare, Sacramento

I. Problems Identified in Establishing Day-Care Services: Some of the reasons for lack of success in establishing day-care services are the following:

1. The inaccessibility of housing, too great distances, lack of transportation.
2. There is lack of real understanding of the program.
3. The cost is generally considered too high even at 9 cents an hour. (The lowest fee set up under the Department of Education's Child-Care Center program.) Low wages were mentioned as an important factor.
4. Securing adequate staff for short-term programs.
5. The day-care center should be open long enough each day so as to meet the needs of the working parents.

II. Possible Solutions:

1. Various means of involving migrant parents in early planning for child-care services. Primarily through personal contacts secure the interest and acceptance of the use of the proposed services.
2. Provision of mobile housing for the child-care service centers.
3. Flexibility in application of State standards.
4. Use of volunteers as well as paid, trained staff.
5. Possibility of developing experimental projects using federal Child-Welfare Services funds.
6. Additional federal funds may become available for use in developing day-care services.

III. Recommendations: That an interdepartmental committee representing the State Departments of Health, Welfare, Education, and Employment be established which would use consultation from organizations representing farm workers, growers, voluntary organizations concerned, etc. The purpose of this committee would be:

1. To make available to interested communities information about resources presently available.
2. To develop with the help of local representative committees demonstration Child Welfare Services which would be established to meet the specific and special needs of the local community with particular reference to the users of the services.

GROUP 4 - HOUSING

Chairman: Albin J. Gruhn, Pres., Calif. Labor Federation, AFL-CIO
Local Host: Ferris Sherman, Executive Director, Housing Authority of Tulare Co.
Coordinator: Perry Nethington, Assistant Chief, Division of Housing, State Dept. of Industrial Relations
Recorder: John N. Cooley, Attorney, Hanford

Panelists: Lowell Nelson, Chief, Division of Housing; Glen Studarus, Chief of Program Operations, Farmers' Home Administration; Fred Young, Executive Director, Riverside Co. Housing Authority; Howard Tokmakian, Senior Planner, Fresno Co. Planning Commission; Domer F. Power, Citrus and Olive Grower, Strathmore; Howard Washburn, Construction Supervisor, Self-help Projects, American Friends Service Committee.

Consultants: Frank Stead, Chief, Environmental Sanitation, Calif. Dept. of Public Health; L. E. Francis, Regional Director, Farmers' Home Administration; Robert Pitts, Asst. to Regional Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency; Earl Rouse, Director, City of Wasco Housing Authority; Maurice Larive, General Housing Manager, Housing Authority, City and County of Fresno; Homer L. Kendrick, Chief Building Inspector, Tulare Co. Building Dept.; Raymond B. Auker, Director, Fresno Co. Community Council; Jerome Salazar, farm worker, CSO, Hanford; P. G. H. Benzenberger, Operator, Seville Water System; Rev. Richard Sample, Mendota; Sidney G. Lang, Area Supvr., Division of Housing, Dept. of Industrial Relations; William T. O'Rear, Secretary, Central Labor Council of Fresno and Madera Counties; Oliver McMillan, Special Consultant, Division of Housing.

The recommendations from this session emanated from a background of a wide range of topics and ideas--free and open discussion from panelists and participants with diverse personalities, attitudes, and convictions. Well-informed leaders and citizens, representing a broad cross section of farmers, farm workers, churches, labor unions, civic groups, federal, state, and local agencies.

Panelists provided thought stimulant for discussion in presentations on: problems of administration and enforcement of housing standards; authorization and limitation under the Housing Act of 1961 for farm housing; transient housing and permanent housing for farm workers; problems in planning rural area development in rural community--lack of standard housing impact on the community; responsibility of grower and farm workers in providing family housing; and the farm worker attempts at home ownership.

Some problems of administration were pinpointed, such as--the problem of maintaining required standards of occupancy of on-farm housing or housing furnished by the employer--fringe area shack towns to which families migrate as a result of the shortage of on-farm housing or because of low income status.

Significant strides of accomplishment were identified as--the requirements for owners or operators to register labor camps with the Division of Housing annually--the extension of dwelling house requirements to unincorporated areas throughout the State with equitable standards, which provides a tool for establishing eligibility for federal assistance in local housing programs--and a continued study of labor camp and fringe area family housing.

Authorization for farm housing under the Housing Act of 1961 was outlined as follows: The Farmers Home Administration, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, serves eligible farmers with credit and needed technical help on farm and money management problems. Loans are made only to applicants unable to obtain adequate credit from other sources at reasonable rates and terms. Rural housing loans are made to eligible farm owners and owners of nonfarm tracts in rural areas and small rural communities with populations of not more than 2500. Loans are made for the construction and repair of needed homes and essential farm buildings. Each loan is scheduled for repayment in accordance with the borrower's ability to repay, over a period not exceeding 33 years. The interest rate is 4 percent. Funds may be used only to finance dwellings and farm service buildings that are adequate but modest in size and design. Insured loans may be made to individual farmers, groups of farmers, and public or private nonprofit organizations to finance housing facilities for domestic farm labor.

The plans which the Housing Authority of the County of Riverside has in progress for the rehabilitation of the Indio Farm Labor Camp by a loan through the Farmers Home Administration. Preliminary drawing of proposed houses and complete master plan of camp were shown, and discussion was held by the panel regarding type of house, anticipated rent, repayment of loan, rate of interest and vacancy loss.

Fresno County faces problems in the development of its rural areas and communities that can in part be alleviated by its long-range planning program. The planner has a threefold responsibility to these rural areas. First, it is his job to prepare a comprehensive general plan to guide future growth and development consistent with the general welfare, public safety and public health. In this job he needs to draw upon the knowledge and guidance of many interested local citizens and groups. The planners second job is the implementation of this plan through the zoning and subdivision ordinances, and the building code. Finally, he must serve as coordinator for the specific problems presented by school, park, utility or highway locations to be sure they serve the purposes of the general plan.

The rural centers of Fresno County have not yet experienced problems of explosive growth. Their problems are principally ones of inadequate public utilities, scattered subdivisions of low standards and inadequate housing quality evidenced by dilapidated structures, crowded conditions, low maintenance standards and a general lack of amenities. There are studies to indicate Fresno County's rural population is becoming more permanent, increasing pressure for improved living conditions for farm laborers.

Any effective solution to these problems requires an expression of community pride and participation in the general plan process. The citizenry must develop community leadership and understand the importance of a sound physical environment to a healthy, stable community.

Enforcement by the county of laws related to building and development, including the zoning and subdivision ordinances, State Housing Law and local building codes is necessary to bring about rural housing and development improvements. Special service districts can be used best to handle problems of a specific area when they are multipurpose. To be effective, every effort should be made to concentrate and encourage growth around urban centers where services can be economically

provided. Finally, self-help programs can be of great importance. Experience has shown that those will succeed only if leadership is available to supply continuing guidance.

There are three approaches to the problem of housing as it affects the people in the low income category: individual ownership, employer-owned housing furnished for regular employees, and public housing. Placing them in the above order is the most desirable for the effect it has on the individual occupying the dwelling. Now comes the problem of accomplishment.

Many people are doing much constructive thinking and planning; however, progress in this field has been slow and very discouraging to many. It is felt that with financial counseling, people who pay the rent they now do for substandard housing could finance an adequate home, if long-term financing at low interest rates were made available.

Employer furnished housing restricts the employee being entirely a free agent. Public housing has its place but is so costly that it relieves only a very small portion of those affected.

It is favored that money be made available at a low rate of interest on long-term loans to service the building of low cost homes. These homes would be sold to people who are interested in saving and there are many who would qualify if such a program were available.

It has been established that farm labor housing is generally substandard due to low income and lack of credit. It is also true that most farm labor families have a home base lived in for more than half the year, usually nine months. (Rosenberg Grant Study) Many of these families own their own homes and improve them as time, money and skill permit.

Periods of unemployment during the winter are usual.

Now that the Farmers Home Administration will make direct loans to rural individuals regardless of occupation, at 4% interest for 33 years, the only ingredient lacking for a self-help housing project is skilled supervision.

This method is used by the United Nations in underdeveloped countries and works. Ten to fifteen families function as a group to build their own homes, under skilled supervision, with F.H.A. funds and their own free time. This way their housing needs are met at a price they can afford, in addition to learning new skills while building.

It is suggested that local communities and organizations assume the responsibility of informing rural families in need of housing of the availability of Farmers Home Administration loans, and assisting in providing skilled supervision where this is needed.

Areas identified as critical from general discussion were: Shortage of standard housing in the vicinity of most farm labor centers in addition to the pressure on the housing authorities to insure physical soundness by keeping dwellings occupied make it difficult, if not impossible, to maintain the availability of such housing solely for seasonal workers.

In considering the possibilities of housing California's migrant agricultural families, it is unrealistic to anticipate the development of any program devised wholly within the framework of private industry. On the one hand mortgage money

for migrant farm housing is scarce--this is high-risk investment. Few migrant families have incomes adequate to meet the demand of the private market. Growers would add too heavily to their cost of operation if they attempted to single-handedly build out of farm profits. Even when we examine the practicability of local communities providing housing through some kind of local program, we recognize that the relatively short periods during which these families remain in a single community would tend to make these local programs somwhat costly.

It would seem then that in the final analysis an effective program for California's migrant farm families must recognize the industry's importance to the State and thereby be organized on a statewide basis. This may well entail some use of existing county housing authorities, which are instruments of the State. Developing such a housing program on this basis would be a simple recognition of the importance of agriculture to the economy of the State.

Recommendations: The section on housing concurred unanimously in the following: The housing needs of California's low-income agricultural worker are critical and demand immediate attention in terms of alleviating shortages of both standard, permanent and seasonal housing. Because of the magnitude of the problem as reflected in the existence and continued growth of rural slums and urban fringe areas, and because of the extremely low income of the agricultural worker, these needs cannot be met by private individuals or groups of individuals alone. Therefore, we recommend to the Governor's Advisory Commission on Housing Problems:

(1) The development of a public program to finance the construction of both low cost, privately owned dwellings and low rental housing for low income agricultural workers. In recognition of the fact that public credit is the key to cheap and ample mortgage funds and that existing federal programs do not meet all the needs in this area of concern, the commission's major consideration should be the feasibility of extending State and local mortgage money either directly or at cost.

The following programs might be considered: (a) State subsidized public housing; (b) Limited dividend housing; (c) Housing by redevelopment companies; (d) Limited profit housing companies; (e) Conversion of projects into cooperatives; (f) Financing of cooperative projects; (g) Mortgage facilities corporation and mortgage corporation financing.

(2) The development of a public program to finance the construction of public facilities, such as water and sewer systems, in instances where the addition of such facilities would result in the rehabilitation of substandard communities.

(3) The development of a program to replace seasonal housing at the existing farm labor centers operated by housing authorities with standard housing for families engaged in seasonal farm work, and the possible construction of additional facilities in areas where labor needs and crop patterns indicate such facilities are needed.

(4) The development of such a program should be based on a thorough study of agricultural labor family housing needs such as is now being conducted by the State Division of Housing. We urge that this study be continued.

We strongly urge that the Governor's Advisory Commission place special emphasis on these recommendations in making its over-all study of California housing problems.

(5) Article 34 of the State Constitution* has proven detrimental to the development of effective housing programs and we recommend that serious study be given to this problem.

*Provides that no low rent public housing project can be developed until the majority of qualified voters in a city, town, or county, has voted upon and approved such issue.

GROUP 5 - EMPLOYMENT

Chairman: Eric Thor, Economist, Giannini Foundation, University of California
Local Host: Verest Hull, Manager, Farm Labor Office, Visalia
Coordinator: Dick Van Duyne, Farm Placement Representative, Hanford
Recorders: Howard Frazier, Regional Consultant, Bureau of Labor Standards, U.S. Dept. of Labor, San Francisco; Burt Spangler, Chief, Domestic Farm Section, Regional Office, Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Dept. of Labor, San Francisco

Panelists: J. B. Quinn, Master, California Grange; Eyvind Faye, Pres., Sunsweet Growers, Inc.; Ed Hinricks, farm worker, Agricultural Workers' Organizing Committee, AFL-CIO; Norman Smith, AWOC, AFL-CIO; Robert Edwards, Regional Representative, Unemployment Insurance, Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Dept. of Labor; Davis McEntire, Professor of Social Welfare and Lecturer in Agricultural Economics, University of California.

Consultants: Bill Maxon, Carver Christian Center, Dos Palos; William A. Metzler, University of California, Davis; Margot Lenhart, Farm Placement Supvr., Calif. Dept. of Employment; Walter Simcich, California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO; William T. O'Rear, Secretary, Central Labor Council, Fresno and Madera Counties

Approximately 70 persons were present in this study group. Mutual interests between workers and farmers were recognized. The worker is primarily interested in earning a sufficient income to insure a decent standard of living for himself and family. The farmer wants to realize a fair profit on his investment and be assured of an adequate labor supply when needed. Subjects explored during the two days included collective bargaining, productivity, unemployment, underemployment, annual work plan, stabilization of farm employment, federal minimum wage law in agriculture, unemployment insurance, problems involved in migrant workers settling down, and related areas.

Summaries of statements made by panel members and the ensuing discussion were as follows:

Ed Hinricks: "We worked for years in Oregon and Washington where the housing was furnished or our trailer rent was paid. I feel this was because the farmers in these two states appreciated our coming in to help with the harvest. In California they had many braceros and the farmers did not care or seem to, if we had a place to stay or not. When the children became older, my wife and I felt it was necessary to settle down so we could have a feeling of security and belonging to one community. We were tired of traveling and wanted to belong. We picked Hilmar, Calif., as our home town and although it meant less work for us and more expenditure for gasoline because of having to drive within a radius of 50 miles for work, we still feel it was something we had to do. It has been a hard struggle but now we belong to a community and even belong to the Grange. In this way, we are being better citizens and teaching our children what it means to belong somewhere."

J. B. Quinn: "The great majority of members of the California Grange are sincerely interested in the welfare of agricultural workers. Most of the farmers pay at least $1.50 an hour. Unfortunately, a small number of the farmers in the State, possibly 10%, prefer to pay as low wages as possible; and this 10% stigmatizes the 90% of the farmers who want to pay decent wages and treat their workers fairly. The California State Grange has gone on record supporting the importation of Mexican workers as long as they are needed in the State and it has also urged the adoption of a federal minimum wage law in agriculture for all states. Agriculture in California represents a $3 billion a year business."

Norman Smith: "My assignment today is to talk of collective bargaining for farm workers. I think we all are aware that this is an entirely new field in which there has never been any collective bargaining except in the most haphazard manner. The only form of collective bargaining that has ever existed as far as the farm workers have been concerned has been on a take-it or leave-it basis. If a worker or group of workers have been dissatisfied with their wages or working conditions in the past, the only way that they could do anything about it was to leave the job. If this occurred at a time of the harvest, for example, when it is at a critical stage, the grower might be put in a very bad position. But it could only be effective when there was a scarcity of labor. If one crew left and was followed by another who had the same complaint and they also left, the grower might make an adjustment with the third crew, but the first and second crews could reap no benefits from this kind of process unless there was a crew ahead who were using the same practices.

"Since the inception of the bracero program, it is our belief that the growers want the domestics to leave because they have a bracero crew ready and waiting to do the work and to take explicit orders and have no chance to deal for themselves.

"Of course we have heard a great deal said about the prevailing wage and that the braceros are paid the same wages as the domestic. We know from experience that no workers, either the domestic or the braceros have ever been consulted prior to the fixing of the wage except for an inquiry as to what they worked for in the previous season. It is the desire of the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee, AFL-CIO, that a few weeks before the planting, the cultivation or the harvesting of a crop, that a committee of the workers who know as much about this work as the grower, sit down together with the growers and come to some kind of ground rules, as to the wages that are going to be paid and other conditions pertinent to the employment. Of course, to do this necessitates an organization both on the part of the growers and the workers.

"We have heard the argument that since agriculture is entirely different from industrial work, that no collective bargaining arrangement could possibly be worked out. This is the same argument that we heard a few years ago in the processing industries. In fact, the same arguments were advanced in our industrial plants. But all of these have been worked out and order has been brought out of chaos.

"In order to have successful collective bargaining, we feel that it will be necessary to have an organization of the growers as well as the workers. Stanislaus County is a typical example. There are 1800 peach growers there. To have contracts with each of these individual growers would be an impractical arrangement. The same thing would hold for the cherry growers in Linden or for the individual citrus growers. Another type of arrangement that we feel would be practical would be a contract between an association of farm labor contractors similar to the arrangement in the construction and building trades with the associated general contractors. We know that this will necessitate a lot of work to bring about the organization, but we feel that the American public is not so callous that they want their food, the most vital thing that we have, produced under the conditions that it is now being produced. Out of our experience over the years, we feel that organization, collective bargaining, and binding contracts are the only things that will bring order out of the chaos that now exists.

"A great deal has been said about the competition of other states with California. For that reason, we would rather have an arrangement that is national in scope. But we cannot rely upon the oft-proposed legislative remedies, because what is given by law can just as easily be taken away by law.

"While we know that it is extremely controversial, we feel that recognition of worker organizations affiliated with the rest of the labor movement is the only solution. Particularly is this so of the small growers who do not make a living from their investment, but make a major portion of their living from work done with their own hands or that of the families. And until the giant corporations that are now dominating the agricultural picture are compelled to pay the same kind of wage and assume the same responsibilities that other comparable businesses do, there can be no hope that the little grower can meet the competition of these corporations."

Eyvind M. Faye: "I have been a prune grower since 1925, and will speak in the light of my own experience in that one commodity. This is vastly different, for example, from tomatoes and yet includes all phases of human relationship. For that is really what we are talking about.

"During these 37 years I have seen quite a change in farming. The start of this period with horses and mules, to our highly mechanized operations of today. No longer can we, in California at least, resort to farming after all else has failed. In one of our leading newspapers the other day, a question was asked of several men as to whether they would like to work on a farm. This was a 'Man-on-the-street' type survey. One man, age 28 said 'no'. He enjoyed city life too much but perhaps when he was 50 or so he might like to try farming. It just isn't done that way any more.

"It takes years of training in many areas to learn the job and an enormous amount of capital. Success in farming today depends on these developed skills and some men have the happy faculty of putting management, including growing, farming, and marketing together in a neat package. Farming is no different from other business ventures--some have what it takes for success and others do not. The same goes for farm labor.

"For all the adverse publicity in recent years I don't think California agriculture generally has done too badly in adjusting to change. I'd like to explain.

"In 1925 our harvest help came out of the East Bay to our farm. We had nothing but a camp ground and people came with their own equipment. As the head of the family was usually employed steady in his home area, these people returned home but with substantial earnings accomplished over a 6-week period (from mid-August to October). When schools opened these people were cooperative and sent their children to school. Mrs. Eleanor K. Bandy, Superintendent of Schools in Yolo County, saw that they were properly oriented even though their short stay disrupted the local schools and caused some crowding.

"This continued to the early depression years--prune prices dropped to an all-time low. Wages dropped also. At this time these people were displaced by the tremendous number of immigrants from the midwest. We entered into a most difficult and distressing period which involved developing new skills in people who were, generally depressed and in many cases suffering from malnutrition.

"At this time we ourselves developed our first "camp". Screened tent platforms with water readily available and a central washing and bathing facility. This gave way in 1947 to an improved camp with flush toilets, electricity and water to each tent, central bath with showers and hot water. This facility we still use.

"More people come in their own trailers now. This has been very satisfactory and we have established regular trailer hookups to sewer, water, and electricity.

"But this group of experienced workers has thinned out. As a result of the war most of the good workers were absorbed in industry and there has been a substantial change in the make-up of the work force. Some of the older of the "Okie" group are still with us--and remain good hands--but not the youngsters. They have learned new skills and it has been my pleasure to do business with them as roofers, mechanics, welders, and see them in such jobs as nurses aides, beauty parlor operators and the many varied jobs in the community.

"When the great emphasis was placed on getting the children back in school--many parents quit their job and left for home rather than put their children in a local school for a couple of weeks. This left a great shortage of help at the tail end of harvest. We adjusted to this situation by using P L 78 people to come for the last week to 10 days of harvest. This was a very upsetting operation but got us by. By increasing our dehydrator capacity we were able to reduce our harvest period. By starting 3 to 5 days earlier we attempted to finish by September 12. But schools then moved their opening up a week--so there we were again.

"Mechanical harvesting has been the next innovation. This not only greatly reduces the number of people required, but has changed the type of person needed. Because families cannot stay through the end of harvest they will be replaced by the machine, and single men or heads of families working alone.

"This brings up a new requirement--a change again in the type of housing required. This is a requirement that will take time to adjust to, for there are not unlimited funds available for capital investment in buildings.

"The capital needs of a farmer are tremendous. Out of his net income must come his living, the purchase of new equipment, payment of mortgages and new building--all this from net after taxes.

"But I'm quite sure, now the pattern is set and we see the type of help we must attract, that the problem will be met.

"Health and welfare of the people on the farm is a real responsibility of the farmer. He must be prepared to take an active interest in the health and living conditions of the migrants who work for him whether he houses them or not. We have had field sanitation units available to our workers now for quite a number of years and the number of units in the area are increasing each year.

"Many workers referred to farmers by State Employment Offices have not been screened as to capabilities and experience. There is no feeling of obligation on the part of the employee to report or to fulfill agreement to work. There has been a general deterioration of workers available since 1946 and a preference for welfare relief rather than working is sometimes noted. There are reports that the California Employment Service is now working on these problems and improved services from the Employment Service are expected in the future. Increased mechanization on the farm has decreased the length of time the workers are needed. Many of the farms now need workers for 25 days a year in contrast to 80 days a year a few years ago.

"The new wage order for women and minors issued by the California Industrial Welfare Commission is resulting in keeping women and minors off the farm. The record keeping required for these employees is enormous and has a tendency to discourage farmers employing women and minors."

Robert Edwards: Mr. Edwards told about what has been done to date by the states in the field of unemployment insurance coverage of agricultural workers. He stated that Hawaii is the only State that has a law covering agricultural workers. This law is administered separately and apart from the regular unemployment insurance law. Its salient provisions are: Farm employers who have 20 or more workers for 20 or more calendar weeks in the current or previous year are required to pay unemployment insurance tax on their employees, from which these employees can draw unemployment insurance benefits during periods of unemployment.

Administrative cost of this program is financed by a direct .001% tax on agricultural employers.

The law also provides for employers to elect either to pay their unemployment tax on a tax-rate schedule, or to reimburse the State on a direct charge basis, for total dollars paid in benefits to their former employees. Several of the major agricultural employers have elected the latter plan.

It was also pointed out that seven States are making studies as to the feasibility of coverage of agricultural workers. The only State in which the study is now complete is Arizona. Findings in this study reveal that a large percentage of agricultural workers in that State had at least 48 weeks of farm employment. It was also noted that seasonal farm workers worked a minimum of 36 weeks throughout the year, at employment which was a combination of farm and industrial.

In projecting the estimated cost rates if farm workers were covered in Arizona, it was determined that such coverage would result in a benefit cost rate of 3.03%.

These studies are not for the purpose of making recommendations for the coverage of agricultural workers, but are for the purpose of adding factual data to the limited information about the agricultural worker, his employment and his unemployment experience. Additionally, these studies are undertaken to develop an application of methodology which might assist other States which are contemplating unemployment insurance coverage for agricultural workers.

A question and answer period followed Mr. Edwards' talk in which questions were raised from the floor concerning the effect which the employment of braceros would have in determining cost rates, and whether or not migrant farm workers could draw unemployment insurance benefits while living in a State other than the State in which they earned their wage credits.

Davis McEntire: "To speak for the interest of the public in farm employment is a perilous, and I fear, somewhat pretentious venture. The public is all of us--farmers, workers, employed and unemployed, rich and poor, and everybody else. Determining the interests of the total community, and balancing them against each other, are, in a free society, the substance of politics and government. No individual can be qualified to assert the interest of the public in the same way that a spokesman for a particular group might be authorized to represent the group interest. Anyone, of course, may speculate or philosophize about what the public interest is or ought to be, and there is no lack of inquiries of this kind. I prefer, however, to take a more factual approach and attempt to discover the public interest from policies actually pursued by public authorities over a period of time.

"From this point of view, it is possible to identify several subjects of broad, well-established public interest which touch upon the employment of farm workers. One of these is the interest of the public in the development of individuals. This interest is manifest in many public policies, above all, in the long-standing

commitment of the American people to universal education at public expense. The American public, expressing its will through all levels of government, wants every individual to develop his potential abilities and become an educated and competent citizen. So imperative is this public interest that both the financial support of education and attendance at school, up to a certain level, have been removed from the area of individual decision and made mandatory obligations upon individuals. In addition to the public schools and institutions of higher education, public authority imposes on the taxpayers the duty to support a variety of other measures, such as adult education, vocational training, and rehabilitation programs, all of the purpose of promoting individual development.

"Obviously, the public has an interest in fostering social economic conditions favorable to education and remedying any condition which inhibits the educational opportunities of any group. Insofar as certain aspects of farm employment such as transiency, isolation from community life, or poor living conditions interfere with the education of children, they are adverse to the public interest.

"Another major goal of public policy is the maintenance of economic conditions such that all persons who desire to work can find opportunity for employment. The public has an interest also in maintaining, for all people, a minimum level of income--an interest demonstrated by legislation for minimum wage, unemployment insurance, and other forms of social security. The health and living conditions of the people, and the conditions of workers' employment are matters of public concern expressed in countless legislative enactments.

"The public is also interested in promoting economical and efficient methods of production throughout the entire economy, for this is basic to economic progress and a rising general standard of living. In relation to agriculture, this public interest has expressed itself, over more than a century, in taxpayer support of scientific research, coupled with extension programs to bring the findings of research to the farmers. Expenditures of tax funds for these purposes have well served the public interest in at least two principal ways: first, by stimulating the production of abundant food and fibre supplies at low cost, and second, by reducing the need of agriculture for manpower.

"Since adequate food and fibre supplies are obviously essential to the national welfare, there is a clear public interest in maintaining production of farm products wanted by consumer. This does not, of course, imply a public interest in preserving any particular method, organization or distribution of production. Rather, the public interest here would seem to lie in the efficiency of the agricultural plant and its capacity to respond to changing needs and demands.

"Finally, the public has an interest in maintaining conditions of relatively equal power among its members in their relations with each other. In a democratic and free society, it is fundamental that no individual or group should become sufficiently powerful to dominate the lives of others and deprive them of their freedom, whether political or economic. Farmers have relied on this principle in their battles with monopolies and in their highly developed organizations for economic and political action. The same principle underlies the antitrust laws and much labor legislation. It is the basis of public concern with the relationships of employers and employees, farm and nonfarm.

"It is clear that the public has an interest in the employment of farm workers from several points of view. The foregoing analysis, however, does not yield an unequivocal answer to a recurrent, urgent problem, that is, the extent of public interest in providing a supply of labor for agriculture. The recognized public interest in the production of needed crops implies a public concern with

procuring the workers to grow and harvest those crops, and this concern is implemented by the activity of the public employment services in the farm labor field, including the importation of foreign contract workers for agriculture. On the other hand, policies adopted to implement the public interest in the development and welfare of people tend constantly to deplete the ranks of farm workers by aiding their advancement to preferred occupations. In other words, the public interests touching farm employment are not wholly compatible.

"Agriculture in California is caught between these conflicting public interests because of its traditional dependence, for seasonal labor, upon the bottom groups in society; whereas it is contrary to American principle and policy that individuals should remain long at the bottom. In the past, a succession of immigrant groups and migrants from impoverished areas within the United States have provided a labor supply for agriculture, augmented during times of depression by unemployed urban workers. As each bottom group in turn started its ascent into the higher ranks, and moved out of agriculture, a new group has appeared to take its place. Thus, the Chinese were succeeded in California farm labor by the Japanese, and they in turn by Mexicans and Filipinos. But in recent years the supply of bottom groups has been running out. Aside from the imported contract workers, the last big group of depressed newcomers to appear on the California agricultural scene was that of the drought and depression migrants from the southwestern plains states during the late 1930's. Members of that group and newer migrants from the same region are still at work on California farms, but the large majority has been assimilated into California's expanding economy and is found no more in the farm labor market. The same is true, to a great extent, of the Mexican immigrants in the second generation. So again is raised the historic question: Where shall the laborers be found?

"One can think of several ways by which a sizeable bottom group of population might again be created. A severe business depression would do it temporarily. Short of a general depression, and even under prosperous conditions, the continued progress of automation and related changes may leave a substantial group of workers unable to find employment in urban labor markets. Another way of creating a labor supply for agriculture would be to lower the barriers to immigration from Mexico or Asia. Alternatively, some positive stimulus and guidance might be given to the migration of rural people from low income areas of the United States. Finally, there is the method actually in operation, namely, the importation of contract workers from Mexico.

"There is room for differing judgments, but in the view of the present speaker, it seems unlikely that a sufficient supply of workers for seasonal farm employment can be obtained in the future by the methods that have prevailed in the past. Immigration from abroad is most unlikely to be resumed. The importation of foreign contract workers is vulnerable to charges of depressing wages and worsening the unemployment situation. Neither the technologically unemployed nor the rural underemployed are likely to be recruitable for seasonal farm jobs in large numbers without special inducements.

"If this estimate is correct, it means that agriculture must in the future obtain a larger part of its labor supply by competing more effectively in the general labor market. This is partly a matter of narrowing the wage gap between agriculture and industry, but no wholly so. In earlier times and other places, the farmer's temporary labor needs have been met, in large part, by drawing into agriculture workers on vacation from their regular jobs and people not normally in the labor force, such as students, housewives, and retired workers. There has been no diminution in the relative numbers of people in these categories; indeed, the

proportion of people with time at their disposition is undoubtedly greater now than in the past. But they avoid agriculture, partly at least, because of the low prestige of farm work, especially field labor. If farm work could be made more respectable in the public eye by improving the conditions associated with it, agriculture's ability to compete for labor would be substantially enhanced.

"Along with efforts to make farm work more attractive to potential workers, much more could be done to use more efficiently the workers available to agriculture. Organization of the farm labor market to bring jobs and workers together in a systematic, planned way has been often discussed but never tried on any substantial scale. The nearest approach, perhaps, is represented in the planning and commitments attached to the employment of imported contract workers. To organize the seasonal labor market on a scale broad enough to be significant is indeed fraught with difficulties, but the potential benefits are great. Fuller utilization of available workers serves the twin aims of reducing the total number of workers needed in an area, and increasing the amount and continuity of employment per worker, with all of the associated benefits that this implies. To develop workable methods of labor market organization is a challenge to government and the farming community. No conceivable approach to the farm labor problem would better serve the public interest."

After the presentations had been made by the panelists the study group agreed that farm workers should have sufficient income to provide for the necessities of life and that there would be benefits to the farmer and to the worker for a national minimum wage in agriculture throughout the country as this would prevent undercutting of wages. It was felt that the economic needs of workers during periods of unemployment can be met by extending unemployment insurance to agricultural workers. The purchasing power thus provided workers helps to stabilize the rural economy and to keep businesses in operation which would otherwise close.

The study group passed resolutions recommending: (1) the adoption of a national minimum wage law for agricultural workers in all states and (2) that the California Department of Employment make a study regarding the feasibility of extending unemployment insurance to employees in agriculture.

GROUP 6 - COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: Allan Grant, First Vice-President, Calif. Farm Bureau Federation
Local Host: Ellsworth Lewis, Farm Labor Committee, American Friends Service Committee, Visalia
Coordinator: Don Charles, First Christian Church, Visalia
Recorder: Jack Bartlett, Kern Co. Farm Labor Ministry

Program Planners: Robert King, Secretary, Rural Health Dept., Calif. Farm Bureau Federation; Wayne Hartmire, Director, Calif. Migrant Ministry, Los Angeles

Panelists: Ed Dutton, Social Planning Consultant for the United Community Fund of San Francisco; Neal Scott, Farm Laborer from Strathmore, and AWOC Steward; Bill Espinoza, Bishop's Committee for Farm Workers, Stockton; Sue Carhart, Migrant Ministry, Corcoran; Jamie Robertson, Grower, Visalia; Joe Rivera, Community Service Organization

Consultants: Mrs. T. R. Schmidt, Dos Palos Migrant Ministry; I. W. Swagerty, Calif. Farm Bureau Federation, Hughson; Luada Boswell, Girl Scouts of America, Los Altos; Carl Siegenthaler, United Presbyterian Church U.S.A., Synod of Calif.; Mrs. Manuel Aguirre, Social Worker, Tulare Co.; Mrs. Jess Lira, Member of the Board, Crowley Community Center, Visalia; Earle Harvey, Calif. Migrant Ministry; Ralph Piepgrass, Grower, Visalia; William Hughes, Director, Catholic Rural Life Conference; Ben Fraticelli, First Christian Church, Dos Palos.

Recommendations: This study group directed its attention to the cultural, racial, and economic barriers that do, in fact, exist between the farm workers' community and that of the established community. It also identified and discussed the barrier that exists in the minds of the people of the established community, and results in their viewing the members of the farm worker community from a viewpoint which is limited and uses a middle-class society set of values to judge a people with a value system different from its own. There was a general feeling that the majority culture should welcome the cultural differences which exist and neither expect nor want a minority group to adjust so completely as to lose its cultural heritage.

Considerable discussion was given to the role of "do-gooder" groups, since the group had recognized that farm worker families want and deserve an opportunity to help themselves. General agreement was reached that the widespread attitude of condescension, of doing things for people, is misplaced and that such energy and money might be better directed elsewhere. Still, acknowledgment was made that there is a great need to bridge the gap between seasonal farm worker families and the established community, and that activities of concerned people serve to do that, although they may not get at the basic needs of farm workers.

Out of this discussion we unanimously passed the following recommendations:

Recognizing that seasonal farm worker families are often isolated from the mainstream of community life, and that farm worker communities are often plagued with problems of disorganization and great physical need, and further recognizing that farm workers are persons of worth, who, by and large, display the motivation and ability to deal with their own problems and to make significant cultural, social, and economic contributions to the larger community, and desiring that these persons become fully productive workers and citizens with an opportunity to labor in accordance with their gifts and training and to join

in the decision-making processes of the total community, we of the Community Development Study Group recommend the following course of action to local communities:

1. We urge formation of community-wide coordinating councils composed of representatives of public and private agencies, elected officials, churchmen, educators, farmers and farm workers. Such a council would bring together the various points of view of decision-making persons and groups with the expectation that vital communication would take place on the farm labor issue and that action would be initiated in areas of substantial agreement. Job retraining is an obvious example of a challenge that can best be met by the cooperative effort of farmers, social workers, educators, and workers.

2. We urge support of community development projects in rural fringe communities that are directed toward helping farm worker families help themselves. Such an effort would not bring solutions from the outside or impose program, but would be an enabling task, directed toward helping persons in need articulate their problems and plan together in responsible programs to deal with these problems. Only in this way will farm worker families fully express their innate dignity and become effective, independent persons fully participant in the affairs of the community at large. Such a community development effort could be sponsored by a coordinating council or by any concerned group in the community.

3. We urge that the Farm Bureau Federation, CSO, Grange, California Migrant Ministry, Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee of the AFL-CIO, the Bishop's Committee for Farm Workers, American Friends Service Committee, public and private agencies, educators, and other interested groups and individuals take steps to enact these resolutions and that the next Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops provide specific opportunity for reports on community development projects underway or under consideration.